



# LIBRARY

OF THE

University of California.

No. ....

406

Division .....

Range .....

890

096

Shelf .....

Received .....

July

1870



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



OVER 1000 MISTAKES CORRECTED.

---

# LIVE AND LEARN:

A GUIDE FOR ALL, WHO WISH TO

SPEAK AND WRITE CORRECTLY:

PARTICULARLY INTENDED AS

A BOOK OF REFERENCE FOR THE SOLUTION OF DIFFICULTIES  
CONNECTED WITH

GRAMMAR, COMPOSITION, PUNCTUATION,

ETC., ETC.

WITH EXPLANATIONS OF LATIN AND FRENCH WORDS AND PHRASES  
OF FREQUENT OCCURRENCE IN NEWSPAPERS, REVIEWS,  
PERIODICALS, AND BOOKS IN GENERAL;  
CONTAINING EXAMPLES OF

ONE THOUSAND MISTAKES

OF DAILY OCCURRENCE,

IN SPEAKING, WRITING, AND PRONUNCIATION;

TOGETHER WITH

DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS FOR WRITING FOR THE PRESS, AND FORMS  
OF ARTICLES IN THE VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS OF  
NEWSPAPER LITERATURE.

---

"There are hundreds of persons, engaged in professional and commercial pursuits, who are sensible of their deficiencies on many points connected with the grammar of their own tongue, and who, by self-tuition, are anxious to correct such deficiencies, and to acquire the means of speaking and writing, if not with elegance, at any rate with a due regard to grammatical accuracy,—to whom this little work is INDISPENSABLE."

"What more important than a correct knowledge of one's own tongue?"—CONDORCET.

---

NEW YORK:  
GARRETT & COMPANY,  
NO 18 ANN STREET.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by

GARRETT & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the  
Southern District of New York.

## P R E F A C E .

OF the practical value of a pocket manual, to which we can refer in cases of grammatical embarrassment, as well as for literary information and suggestions, there can be no doubt. In the preparation of the present volume it has been the aim of the author to make such a work. Whether he has succeeded, is a question to be decided by the reader.

There are hundreds of persons engaged in professional and commercial pursuits, who are sensible of their deficiencies on many points connected with the grammar of their own tongue, and who, by self-tuition, are anxious to correct such deficiencies, and to acquire the means of writing and speaking, if not with elegance, at any rate with a due regard to grammatical accuracy.

For such persons this little volume is more particularly intended, though it is believed that few can peruse it without deriving advantage, and also acquiring *some* additional knowledge.

It is a conventional, and, unfortunately, a widely-spread error, that correctness in speaking and writing comes as *a matter of course*, and especially when the individual has received what is called "a CLASS-

ICAL *education*.”—A glance at the article on “Instances of False Syntax, Errors, &c., &c., (see page 73,) occurring in the writings of authors of eminence,” [men educated at the Public Schools and Universities,] will at once prove the fallacy of this impression.

Our little volume will also be found useful by those who desire to write for the press. To all such, the *forms* of *department* articles will prove both interesting and valuable. A careful examination of these forms will enable the student to obtain an intelligent understanding of the various departments in newspaper literature, and also furnish him with materials for deciding for which to qualify himself—editing or reporting.

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
1. Rules for the Use of Capitals and Italics	1
2. Division of Words into Syllables . . . . .	5
3. On the Hyphen . . . . .	6
4. Rules for Spelling . . . . .	8
5. On Nouns . . . . .	12
6. On Gender . . . . .	13
7. On the Formation of the Plural Number of Nouns	21
8. On the Verb . . . . .	28
9. On the Participle . . . . .	29
10. On <i>Shall</i> and <i>Will</i> . . . . .	33
11. On Irregular Verbs . . . . .	34
12. Corresponding Conjunctions . . . . .	41
13. Miscellaneous Observations on Points that occasion difficulty to the Student . . . . .	42
On the letters <i>w</i> and <i>y</i> : see No. 1.	
On <i>a</i> and <i>an</i> : see Nos. 2, 10, and 13.	
On the possessive case; see No. 3.	
On the degrees of comparison: see Nos. 4, 14, 18, 19, 38, 40, and 64.	
On the pronouns <i>you</i> , <i>thou</i> , <i>your</i> , <i>thy</i> , &c.: see Nos. 6, 7, and 80.	
On the pronouns <i>who</i> , <i>that</i> , <i>which</i> , and <i>what</i> : see Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 34, and 88.	
On <i>each</i> , <i>every</i> , <i>either</i> , and <i>neither</i> : see Nos. 28, 29, 37, and 46.	
On the participles: see Nos. 44, 48, 50, and 51.	
On the omission of the sign <i>to</i> before certain verbs: see No. 52.	
On negatives; see Nos. 55, 56, 57, and 58.	
On the right position of adverbs: see Nos. 59 and 60.	

Miscellaneous Observations, &c. (*cont.*)—

On idiomatic expressions : see Nos. 42, and 79.

On the expressions *two first, two last*, &c. : see No. 85.

On *each other* and *one another* : see No. 92.

On *this* and *that* in the sense of *former* and *latter* : see No. 104.

On other important peculiarities see the remaining Numbers.

14. Hints on the current improprieties of expression in writing and speaking, with rules for their correction, . . . . . 77
15. On Composition . . . . . 95
16. On Punctuation . . . . . 108
17. Figures of Speech . . . . . 121
18. Explanation of *Latin* words and phrases of frequent occurrence in newspapers, reviews, periodicals, and books in general . . . . . 129
19. Explanation of *French* words and phrases of frequent occurrence in newspapers, reviews, periodicals, and books in general . . . . . 141
20. On Abbreviations . . . . . 145
21. Over 500 mistakes of daily occurrence, in speaking, writing and pronunciation, corrected . . . . . 149
22. Rhetorical Composition, . . . . . 194
23. On Composition for the Press, with Forms of Articles in the various departments of Newspaper Literature, . . . . . 200

A GUIDE FOR ALL,  
WHO WISH TO  
SPEAK AND WRITE CORRECTLY,  
&c., &c., &c.

---

RULES FOR THE USE OF CAPITALS AND  
ITALICS.

THE following classes of words should commence with capital letters :

1. The first word of a sentence.
2. The first word of every line in poetry.
3. The first word of a *direct* quotation.

*Examples* :—And Nathan said unto David, “*Thou* art the man.”—Remember this ancient maxim : “*Know* thyself.”

An *indirect* quotation may be introduced without the use of a capital.

*Example* :—It is recorded of him, who “*spake* three thousand proverbs,” that “*his* songs were a thousand and five.”

4. Words used as names of the Deity.

*Examples* :—“Our *Father*, who art in Heaven.”  
—“Remember now thy *Creator*, in the days of thy youth.”

“And chiefly thou, O *Spirit*, that dost prefer.

Before all temples, the upright heart and pure.”

*Milton.*



## 5. Proper names and honorary titles.

*Examples* :—"The City of *London*."—"The Honorable *Henry Erskine*:"—"Sir *Matthew Hale*."

## 6. Common nouns personified.

*Examples* :—"If *Pain* comes into a heart, he is quickly followed by *Pleasure*; and if *Pleasure* enters, you may be sure that *Pain* is not far off."  
—*Addison*.

"And *Discipline* at length,  
O'erlooked and unemployed, fell sick and died;  
Then *Study* languished, *Emulation* slept,  
And *Virtue* fled."—*Cowper*.

## 7. Every important word in a phrase used as a title.

*Examples* :—"Hume's *History of England*:"—"Virtue the only true *Source of Nobility*:"—"The *Board of Trade*."—"The *French Revolution*."

The pronoun *I* and the interjection *O* should also be written in capitals.

*Examples* :—"Must *I* endure all this?"—

"Come forth, *O* ye children of gladness, come!"

Most adjectives, derived from proper names, should commence with capitals.

*Examples* :—"A *Grecian* education was considered necessary to form the *Roman* orator, poet, or artist."—"The *Copernican* system is that which is held to be the true system of the world."

A personal pronoun referring to the Deity, is often commenced with a capital.

*Examples* :—"All that we possess is God's, and we are under obligation to use it all as *He* wills."

“Will *He* not hear thee  
Who the young ravens heareth from their nest?  
Will *He* not guard thy rest?”—*Hemans*.

There are also numerous cases in which words may commence either with capitals or small letters, according to the taste of the writer.

Short detached pieces of writing are often composed entirely of capitals. [For examples, see title-pages, heads of chapters and sections, monumental inscriptions, cards, &c.]

*Italic* letters are those which stand *inclining*. *This sentence is printed in Italics.*

When an author wishes to distinguish any particular word or phrase for the sake of emphasis, or for any other purpose, it is generally printed in *Italics*.

*Examples* :—“If we regard enunciation and pronunciation as the *mechanical* part of elocution—infection, emphasis, and pausing, may be designated as its *intellectual* part.”—*Russell*. “To be perfectly polite, one must have great *presence of mind*, with a delicate and quick *sense of propriety*.”

*Mrs. Chapone.*

Sentences of special importance are often printed entirely in *Italics*.

When a particular word, phrase, or sentence is designed to be made still more conspicuous than it would be, if expressed in *Italics*, it is printed in small capitals.

*Examples* :—“OBSERVATION and EXPERIMENT constitute the basis of the science of Mechanics.”  
—“To the numerous class of young men who are mainly dependent on their own resources for know-

ledge, or respectability, one of the most important councils of wisdom, which can be addressed, is STUDY YOUR OWN CHARACTER AND PROSPECTS."

When a word or phrase in an *Italic sentence* is to be distinguished from the rest, it should be printed in *Roman* letters. If it is particularly important, it may be expressed in capitals.

*Examples* :—"The grand clue to all syntactical parsing is the sense."—"HYDROSTATICS is that branch of Natural Philosophy which treats of the mechanical properties and agencies of LIQUIDS."—"To find the surface of a REGULAR SOLID."

When a word is used merely as a *word*, it should generally be printed in Italics.

*Examples* :—"The adjective *same* is often used as a substitute."—"Who is applied to persons, and *which* to animals and inanimate things."

Words and phrases introduced into English writings from foreign languages, are generally expressed in Italics.

*Example* :—"An adjournment *sine die* is an adjournment without fixing the time for resuming business."

In the common English version of the Scriptures. Italics are used to indicate those words, which are not found in the original.

*Examples* :—"After two days was *the feast of the passover*:" in the original, "After two days was the passover."—"There are yet four months, and *then cometh the harvest*:"—in the original, "There are yet four months, and the harvest cometh."

In *writing*, it is customary to underline such words as would be italicised in printing.

*Example.*

“It does not seem possible, even after the testimony of our senses.”

---

#### DIVISION OF WORDS INTO SYLLABLES.

As a general principle, it may be observed that the syllables of a word are those divisions which are made in a correct pronunciation of it.

The following are, perhaps, the only *definite* rules, that can be given on this subject.

1. Two consonants forming but one sound, as *ng*, *ch*, *th*, *sh*, *ph*, *wh*, are never separated. Thus, we write *church-es*, *wor-thy*, *feath-er*, *ring-ing*, *a-while*.

2. The terminations *cean*, *cian*, *ceus*, *cious*, *cial*, *tian*, *tion*, *tious*, *tial*, *geon*, *gian*, *geous*, *gious*, *sion*, and *sier*, are seldom divided. Thus, we write, *na-tion*, *o-cean*, *capa-cions* *pi-geon*, *cap-tious*.

3. Compound words are commonly separated into the simple words, of which they are composed; as, *care-less*, *bee-hive*, *rail-road*.

4. The termination *ed*, though not always pronounced separately, is regarded in writing as a distinct syllable; as *lov-ed*, *burn-ed*.

5. Derivative and grammatical terminations should generally be separated from the radical word: as, *great-ly*, *teach-er*, *rush-est*, *prov-est*.

## ON THE HYPHEN.

The *Hyphen* [-] is used at the end of a line, when the whole of a word cannot be got into it, and shows that the rest of the word is at the beginning of the following line.

Some compound words are connected with the hyphen, others without it. Writers are not agreed on the subject of inserting and omitting the hyphen. The following REMARKS may be of use :—

1. When each of two contiguous nouns retains its original accent, the hyphen is not used ; as, *Master builder*.

2. When two nouns are *in opposition*, and each is separately applicable to the person or thing designated, the hyphen is not used ; as *The Lord Chancellor*, who is both a *Lord* and a *Chancellor*.

3. When the first noun is used as an adjective, and expresses the matter or substance, of which the second consists, and may be placed after it with *of* not denoting possession, the hyphen is not used ; as, *a silk gown*, *a cork jacket* ; that is, a gown of silk, a jacket of cork.

When the first noun is not used as an adjective, does not express the matter or substance of the second, and may be placed after it with *of* denoting possession, or with *for*, *belonging to*, &c., the hyphen is used : as, *a silk-mill*, a mill for silk ; *a cork-screw*, a screw for corks ; *a horse-dealer*, a dealer in horses ; *a kitchen-grate*, a grate for a kitchen.

When the words readily coalesce, are easily pronounced as one, have long been associated together



and are in frequent use, the hyphen is often omitted, and *both* nouns are printed or written as *one*; thus, *Bookseller*, a seller of books; *Schoolmaster*, the master of a school.

The necessity of attending to the hyphen will be evident from the following examples: A *glass house*, a *tin man*, an *iron mould*, a *negro merchant*, pronounced as separate words, and each with its natural accent, will mean a *house made of glass*, a *man made of tin*, a *mould made of iron*, a *merchant, who is a negro*; but a *glass-house*, a *tin-man*, an *iron-mould*, a *negro-merchant*, taken as compound nouns, with the accent on the first syllable, will mean a *house for the manufacture of glass*, a *man who works or deals in tin*, a *mould for casting iron*, or a *mould or stain caused by the rust of iron*, a *merchant, who buys and sells negroes*.

It would, perhaps, be an improvement in such cases, to use a hyphen similar to that which is used by some foreign printers [=], as this would enable the student, on meeting with a compound word, printed part of it at the end of one line, and part at the beginning of the following line, to know whether the words should be connected with a hyphen or not. If they should be connected by a hyphen, this one = would be used; if not, the common hyphen -.

4. When a compound noun consists of an adjective and a noun, no hyphen is used; as, *High Sheriff*, *Chief Magistrate*.

When the adjective and its noun are used together as a kind of compound adjective to another noun, a hyphen is inserted between the two former; thus, *The High-Church doctrine*.

5. When an adjective or adverb, and a participle immediately following, are used together as a kind of compound adjective, merely expressing a quality, without reference to immediate action, and precede the noun to which they are joined, a hyphen is used; as, *A quick-sailing vessel; The above-mentioned circumstances.*

When they imply immediate action, and follow the noun, the hyphen is not used; as, *The ship quick sailing o'er the deep* [or, *Quick sailing o'er the deep, the ship*] *pursues her course. The circumstances above mentioned.*

---

#### RULES FOR SPELLING.

1. Final consonants are generally single; as in *man, book, repeat.*

The final letters in *add, ebb, odd, jagg, egg, err, purr, burr, inn, butt, and buzz*, are exceptions to this rule. We must also except *f, l, and s*, immediately preceded by a single vowel, or by *gu* or *qu*, and a single vowel. Under these circumstances, *f*, and, in monosyllables, *l* and *s*, are doubled, as in *rebuff, call, guess, quill*; except in *as, has, was, gas, his, is, this, thus, us, yes, is, if, of* and its compounds *hereof, whereof, &c.* Concerning *l* and *s* in words of more than one syllable, no certain rule can be given.

*C* assumes *k* at the end of all monosyllables, except *lac, zinc, and arc.*

*K* was formerly used after *c*, in many words of more than one syllable; but it is now generally omitted, except in some few words; as, *attack, hillock, bullock.*



2. Words ending in *y* preceded by a consonant, change *y* into *i* on receiving an addition,\* unless this addition is *'s*, or a syllable beginning with *i*; as, *carry, carries, carrier*; *fancy, fancied, fanciful*; —*lady, lady's*; *carry, carrying*.

3. But words ending in *y* preceded by a vowel, generally retain the *y* on taking an increase; as, *boy, boys, boyish*,

EXCEPTIONS.—*Paid, laid, lain, saith, said*, and most of their compounds, as, *unpaid, mislaid*, are exceptions to this rule.

4. Words ending in silent *e*, generally reject the *e*, before an additional syllable beginning with a vowel; as, *move, movest,† moving, movable*.

Exc. 1.—Words ending in *oe*, retain the final *e*; as, *shoe, shoeing*; *hoe, hoeing*.

Exc. 2.—When *e* is preceded by *c* or *g*, it is retained before *ous* and *able*; as, *courageous, peaceable*.

Exc. 3.—The *e* is retained in a few words to prevent ambiguity; as in *singeing*, to distinguish it from *singing*; in *dyeing* [*colouring*], to distinguish it from *dying* [*expiring*].

Exc. 4.—Words terminating in *ee*, drop the final letter only when the addition begins with *e*; as, *see, seer, seeth*; *flee, fleest*; *agree, agreed*.

Final *ie*, besides dropping *e*, changes *i* into *y*, before an additional syllable beginning with *i*; as, *lie, lying*.

\* The 2nd, 4th, and 6th rules are not intended to include such additions as form compound words.

† *Movest* is formed in accordance with the rule, by dropping the *e* in *move*, and adding *est*.

5. Words ending in silent *e* generally retain *e* on receiving an additional syllable beginning with a consonant; as, *large*, *largely*.

Exc.—*Duly*, *truly*, *wholly*, *awful*, *judgment*, *abridgment*, *acknowledgment*, and *argument*, are exceptions.

Before *fy* and *ty*, *e* is sometimes changed into *i*; as, *pure*, *purity*, *purify*.

6. Monosyllables and words accented on the last syllable, ending in a single consonant preceded by a single vowel, generally double the final consonant, on taking an additional syllable beginning with a vowel; as, *tan*, *tanner*; *fulfil*, *fulfilling*.

Exc. 1.—*X* and *z* are never doubled; and when the accent is shifted, the final letter remains single; as, *wax*, *waxen*; *confer*, *conference*. *Excel* follows the general rule; as in *excellence*.

Exc. 2.—The derivatives of *gas* have only one *s*; as, *gases*, *gasify*.

When a diphthong precedes the final letter, or when the accent is not on the last syllable, the consonant is not doubled, on assuming an additional syllable; as, *boil*, *boiling*; *visit*, *visitor*.

Respecting words ending in *l* and *p*, which are not accented on the last syllable, usage is not settled. In many words these letters are most frequently doubled; as, *travel*, *traveller*, *worship*, *worshipper*.

Many words ending in *c* assume *k* on taking an additional syllable beginning with *e*, *i*, or *y*; as, *frolic*, *frolicked*, *frolicking*.

7. Words ending in a double consonant generally

retain both consonants on receiving an addition ; as, *call, calls, caller, calling.*

Exc.—Some words ending in *ll* drop one *l* on receiving an increase beginning with a consonant ; as, *full, fulness, fully.*

8. Compound words are usually spelled in the same manner as the simple words, of which they are composed ; as, *here-after, ice-house.*

Exc.—An *e* is dropped in *wherever* ; and words ending in *ll* often drop one *l* in composition ; as, *with-al, un-til, al-ready.*

*E* is inserted before *s*, in forming the plural of nouns and the third person singular of verbs, ending in *ch* soft, *sh, s, x, z, o, or y*, preceded by a consonant ; as, *churches, wishes, hisses, cooes, flies.*

Exc.—*Cameo, embryo*, and nouns ending in *io*, form the plural by adding *s* alone. In the following words *e* is commonly, but not uniformly, omitted :—*Canto, solo, grotto, junto, quarto, octavo, portico, tyro, zero*, and a few others.

Many words in our language admit of two or more different modes of spelling ; as, *connection, connexion ; inquire, enquire ; negotiate, negociate ; riband, ribband ; ribon, ribbon ; chemistry, chymistry.*

In such cases, the prevailing usage is to be learnt by observing the practice of the standard authors of the present day, and by consulting the best dictionaries.

In some kinds of writing, such as bills and inscriptions, symbols are often used to represent either whole words or parts of words ; as, XII, 18, 29th,

&c. But in literary compositions, elegant usage generally rejects these, except in giving dates, and the several divisions of a subject.

---

## ON NOUNS.

A *noun* is a word used to express the *name* of an object; as, *Europe, boy, slate, honor.*

Nouns are of two kinds;—*proper* and *common*.

A *proper noun* is the name used to distinguish an *individual* object from others of the same class; as, *Thomas, Dublin, Severn, Etna, August.*

A *common noun* is a name which may be applied to any one of a whole *class* of objects; as, *desk, cottage, village, scholar.*

Common nouns embrace also the particular classes, termed *abstract, verbal* or *participial*, and *collective*.

An *abstract noun* is the name of a quality considered apart from the object to which it belongs; as, *hardness, strength, wisdom, benevolence.* Thus, in *beautiful flower*, the quality expressed by the word *beautiful*, when considered as separated from the object *flower*, forms the abstract noun *beauty*.

A *participial noun* is a word which has the form of a participle, and performs the office of a noun; as, “They could not avoid *submitting* to this influence.”

A *collective noun*, or *noun of multitude*, is a name, that denotes a collection of many individuals; as, *school, flock, people, assembly.*

## ON GENDER.

Gender is the distinction of objects with regard to sex.

There are three genders ;—the *masculine*, the *feminine*, and the *neuter*.

Nouns, which denote males, are of the *masculine* gender ; as, *man, brother, king, father*.

Nouns, which denote females, are of the *feminine* gender ; as, *woman, sister, queen, mother*.

Nouns, which denote objects neither male nor female, are of the *neuter* gender ; as, *rock, wind, paper, knowledge*.

Some nouns are equally applicable to both sexes : as, *cousin, friend, neighbour, parent, person, servant*. The gender of these is usually determined by the context. To such words some grammarians have applied the unnecessary and improper term *common gender*. Murray justly observes, “ There is no such gender belonging to the language. The business of parsing can be effectually performed without having recourse to a *common gender*.”—The term is more useful, and less liable to objection, as applied to the learned languages ; but with us it is plainly a solecism.

Nouns of the masculine or feminine gender are frequently used in a general sense, including both sexes ; as, “ And with thee will I break in pieces the *horse* and *his* rider,” *Jer.* li. 21. “ Go to the *ant*, thou sluggard ; consider *her* ways, and be wise,” *Prov.* vi. 6.



When we speak of males and females of our own species without regard to sex, we generally employ a term in the masculine gender; as, "*Man* is mortal;" "*The authors and poets* of the age."

In speaking of young children, and of animate objects, whose sex is unknown, we often employ the neuter pronoun *it*; as, "The child was well, when I saw *it*;" "He caught the bird, but *it* soon escaped from him."

In the English language the gender of nouns follows the order of nature; but in the Greek, Latin, and German tongues, the grammatical genders are frequently assigned without regard to sex; while in the French, Italian, &c., which have no neuter gender, every object is, of necessity, regarded as either masculine or feminine.

By a figure of speech called *Personification*, gender is sometimes attributed to objects without sex. Thus the *sun*, *time*, *death*, &c., are usually considered as masculine; and the *earth*, a *ship*, *virtue*, &c., are commonly characterised as feminine.

This figurative mode of expression, by which we give life and sex to things inanimate, contributes greatly to the force and beauty of our language, and renders it, in this respect, superior to the polished languages of Greece and Rome.

No fixed rule can be given to determine, in all cases, which gender should be assigned to inanimate objects personified. Those, which are distinguished for boldness or strength, are generally regarded as masculine; and those, which are distinguished for beauty or timidity, are generally characterised as

feminine. Abstract nouns, and the names of ships, cities, and countries, are usually considered as feminine.

*Examples*:—"They arrived too late to save the *ship*, for the violent current had set *her* more and more upon the bank."—*Irving*. "Statesmen scoffed at *Virtue*, and *she* avenged herself by bringing their counsels to naught."—*Russell*.

"*Earth*, with *her* thousand voices, praises God."  
*Coleridge*.

"Where rolls the *Oregon*, and hears no sound,  
Save *his* own dashings."—*Bryant*.

"The *oak*  
Shall send *his* roots abroad, and pierce thy  
mould."—*Bryant*.

"Child of the Sun, refulgent *Summer* comes:  
*He* comes attended by the sultry hours,  
And ever-fanning breezes, on *his* way;  
While, from *his* ardent looks, the turning *Spring*  
Averts *her* blushful face."—*Thomson*.

#### ON THE FORMATION OF THE PLURAL NUMBER OF NOUNS.

The plural of nouns is generally formed by adding *s* or *es* to the singular.

Words ending in a sound, which will unite with the sound of *s*, form the plural by adding *s* only; as, *herd*, *herds*; *tree*, *trees*.

Words ending in a sound, which will not unite with the sound of *s*, form the plural by adding *es*; as, *fox*, *foxes*; *lash*, *lashes*.



Words ending in silent *e*, whose last sound will not combine with the sound of *s*, add *s* only for the plural; as, *rose, roses; voice, voices*.

Most nouns ending in *o*, preceded by a consonant, form the plural by the addition of *es*; as, *cargo, cargoes; hero, heroes*; but the following nouns are commonly written in the plural with *s* only:—*canto, folio, grotto, junto, motto, memento, nuncio, punctilio, portico, quarto, octavo, solo, zero, seraglio, and tyro*. There are also a few others, with respect to which, usage is not uniform.

Several nouns ending in *f* or *fe* change their termination into *ves* in the plural; as, *leaf, leaves; life, lives; beef, beeves; shelf, shelves; knife, knives*. Others, as, *chief, dwarf, five, grief, gulf, handkerchief, hoof, proof, roof, reproof, safe, scarf, strife, surf, turf*, and most of those ending in *ff*, form the plural regularly; as, *gulf, gulfs; muff, muffs. Staff* has *staves* in the plural, but its compounds are regular; as, *flagstaff, flagstaffs*.

Nouns ending in *y* after a consonant form the plural by changing *y* into *ies*; as, *lady, ladies*. But nouns ending in *y* after a vowel form the plural regularly; as, *day, days*.

Many words ending in *y* were formerly spelled with *ie* in the singular; as, *glorie, vanitie*. The termination *ie* in the singular is now laid aside for *y*, while the old plural termination *ies* is retained; as, *glory, glories; vanity, vanities*.

The plurals of the following nouns are variously formed:—*man, men; woman, women; child, children; ox, oxen; mouse, mice; tooth, teeth; goose, geese;*

*foot, feet; brother, brothers* [when applied to persons of the same family]; *brother, brethren* [when applied to persons of the same society or profession]; *die, dies* [stamps for coining]; *die, dice* [small cubes for gaming]; *genius, genii* [aërial spirits]; *genius, geniuses* [men of genius]; *pea, pease* [the species]; *pea, peas* [the seeds as distinct objects]; *penny, pence* [in computation]; *penny, pennies* [as distinct pieces of coin].

*Spoonful, mouse-trap, camera-obscura, Ave-Maria*, and other similiar compound nouns form the plural regularly; as, *spoonfuls, mouse-traps, camera-obscuras, Ave-Marias*. But words, composed of an adjective and a noun, or of two nouns connected by a preposition, generally form the plural by adding *s* to the first words; as, *court-martial, courts-martial; knight-errant, knights-errant; aide-de-camp, aides-de-camp; cousin-german, cousins-german; son-in-law, sons-in-law*. Letters and numeral figures are generally pluralised by adding an apostrophe with the letter *s*; as, *Twelve a's; three 5's*. The plural of words, considered as words merely, is formed in the same manner.

*Examples:—*“I busied myself in crossing my *t's* and dotting my *i's* very industriously.”—*Willeis*. “The first or leading figures change from 9's to 0's.”—*Hutton*. “Who, that has any taste, can endure the incessant, quick returns of the *also's*, and the *likewise's*, and the *moreover's*, and the *however's*, and the *notwithstanding's*?”—*Campbell's* “Philosophy of Rhetoric.”

Many nouns adopted from foreign languages retain their original plurals.

Alumnus	alumni
Arcanum	arcana
Automaton	automata, automatons
Amanuensis	amanuenses
Antithesis	antitheses
Analysis	analyses
Axis	axes
Apex	apices, apexes
Appendix	appendices, appendixes
Basis	bases
Beau	beaux
Bandit	banditti, bandits
Criterion	criteria, criterions
Crisis	crises
Calx	calces, calxes
Chrysalis	chrysalides
Cherub	cherubim, cherubs
Datum	data
Desideratum	desiderata
Dogma	dogmas, dogmata
Diaeresis	diaereses
Ellipsis	ellipses
Emphasis	emphases
Ephemeris	ephemerides
Effluvium	effluvia
Encomium	encomiums, encomia
Erratum	errata
Focus	foci
Fungus	fungi, funguses
Formula	formulas, formulae

Gymnasium	gymnasia, gymnasiums
Genus	genera
Hypothesis	hypotheses
Ignis fatuus	ignes fatui
Index	indices [referring to algebraic quantities]
Index	indexes [pointers or tables of contents]
Lamina	laminae
Larva	larvae
Medium	media, mediums
Memorandum	memoranda, memorandums
Momentum	momenta, momentums
Metamorphosis	metamorphoses
Miasma	miasmata
Monsieur	messieurs
Nebula	nebulae
Oasis	oases
Phenomenon	phenomena
Parenthesis	parentheses
Phasis	phases
Radius	radii
Scholium	scholia, scholiums
Stratum	strata
Stamen	stamens, stamina
Stimulus	stimuli
Seraph	seraphim, seraphs
Speculum	specula
Thesis	theses
Vortex	vortices

Some nouns have the same form in both numbers ;

as, *deer, sheep, swine, trout, salmon, congeries, series, species, means, odds, bellows*; — *ethics, mathematics, methaphysics, pneumatics, optics*, and other similiar names of sciences.

There are also several nouns of number, which do not commonly vary their forms in the plural; as, “*Six dozen*,” “*Three score and ten*.”

The words *horse, foot*, and *infantry*, denoting bodies of soldiers, are singular in form, but plural in signification. *Cavalry* is often used in the same manner. The words *cannon, sail*, and *head*, are also frequently employed in a plural sense.

*Examples*:—“Nelson now proceeded to his station with eight *sail* of frigates under his command.”—*Southey*. “A body of a thousand *horse* was sent forward to reconnoitre the city.”—*Robertson*. “He ordered two *cannon* to be fired.”—*Irving*.

The following words, though sometimes used as singular nouns, are more properly plural:—*alms, amends, pains, riches, wages*.

The following are used only in the plural:—

Annals	Drawers [an article of
Archives	dress]
Ashes	Dregs
Assets	Embers
Billiards	Entrails
Bitters	Goods
Bowels	Hatches
Breeches	Hose [stockings]
Clothes	Hysterics
Calends	Ides

Literati	Pleiads
Lees	Snuffers
Letters [literature]	Scissors
Lungs	Shears
Minutiae	Shamblers
Manners	Tidings
Morals	Tongs
Nippers	Thanks
Nones	Vespers
Orgies	Vitals
Pincers	Victuals

Nouns, denoting objects, which do not admit of plurality, are used only in the singular; as, *gold, silver, wheat, wine, flour, industry, pride, wisdom.*

When, however, different *kinds* or *varieties* are spoken of, words of this class sometimes take the plural form; as, “The *waters* of Germany;”—“The *wines* of France.” The different species or classes are here signified, and not a number of individuals of the same class.

The word *news* is now regarded as singular, though it was formerly used in both numbers. Shakspeare has it most frequently in the plural.

Proper names are sometimes pluralised like other nouns: as, The two *Scipios*, the *Howards*, the *Johnsons*; but these plural names are not used to designate individuals, and may with more propriety be classed with common nouns.

In forming the plural of a proper name and a title, taken as one complex noun, the plural termination is most frequently annexed to the title only:—



*Examples* :—"The *Misses Vanhomrigh*."—*Edinburgh Journal*. "*Messrs. Percy*."—*Southey*.

In forming the plural of proper names, to which titles are prefixed, usage is still unsettled. While a decided majority of our popular writers pluralise the title and not the name, as the "*Misses Morgan*," there is also a large class of writers equally reputable, who pluralise the name and not the title; as, "*The Miss Morgans*."

*Examples* :—"The *Miss Thomsons*."—*Fuller*. "*The two Miss Flamboroughs*."—*Goldsmith*.

Beside the two forms already exhibited, there is still another, in which the plural termination is annexed to both the name and the title; as, "*The Misses Morgans*." This form, though not very common, is not entirely destitute of authority.

*Examples* :—"The *Messrs. Wilsons*."—*Jones*. "*The two Misses Beauvoirs*."—*Blackwood*.

The proper names of nations, societies, groups of islands, and chains of mountains, are generally plural; as, *The French*, *The Moravians*, *The Azores*, *The Alps*, *The Andes*.

## ON THE VERB.

A *Verb*\* is a word, which expresses an assertion or affirmation; as, *I am*; *I teach*; *I am taught*.

Verbs are divided into *regular* and *irregular*.

\* The term *verb* is derived from the Latin *verbum*, which signifies *a word*. This part of speech is so called, because the verb is the principal *word* in the sentence.



A *regular verb* is one, which forms its past tense and perfect participle by adding *d* or *ed* to the present; as, present, *love*; past, *loved*; perfect participle, *loved*; *call*, *called*, *called*.

Regular verbs terminating in silent *e* form their past tense and perfect participle by the addition of *d* only, and those ending in any other letter, by the addition of *ed*.

The verbs *hear*, *pay*, *say* and *lay*, which do not end in *e*, and which add *d* only for the past tense and perfect participle, are classed with irregular verbs.

An *irregular verb* is one, which does not form its past tense and perfect participle by adding *d* or *ed* to the present; as, present, *see*; past, *saw*; perfect participle, *seen*; *go*, *went*, *gone*.

---

## ON THE PARTICIPLE.

The *participle* is a mode of the verb, partaking of the properties of the verb and the adjective; as, *seeing*, *seen*, *having seen*, *having been seen*.

Participles may be classed under two general divisions: *imperfect\** and *perfect*.

\* “The *distinguishing characteristic* of this participle is, that it denotes an unfinished and progressive state of the being, action, or passion; it is therefore properly denominated the IMPERFECT participle.”—*Brown*.

“All that is peculiar to the participles is, that the one signifies a *perfect* and the other an *imperfect* action.”—*Pickbourn*.

“The most unexceptionable distinction which grammarians make between the participles, is, that the one points to the continuation of the action, passion, or state denoted by the verb, and the other to the completion of it.”—*Murray*.

An *imperfect* participle denotes the continuance of an action or state ; as, *calling, seeing, being seen*.

Imperfect participles relate to present, past, or future time, according as they are connected with verbs in the present, past, or future tense.

A *perfect* participle denotes the completion of an action or state ; as, *called, seen, having seen*.

Participles are also divided into simple and compound.

A simple participle is a participle that consists of only one word ; as, *doing, done*.

A compound participle is a participle that is composed of two or more words ; as, *being seen, having seen, having been seen*. *Being seen* is a compound imperfect participle ; *having seen* and *having been seen* are compound perfect participles.

Participles, like other modifications of the verb, have a transitive, an intransitive, and a passive use. Thus, *seeing* and *having seen* are transitive ; *being* and *walking*, intransitive ; *seen* and *having been seen*, passive.

Participles often lose their verbal character, and become adjectives ; as, "A *moving* spectacle ;" "A *revised* edition." They are then called *participial adjectives*.

Participles are also used to perform the office of nouns ; as, "They could not avoid *submitting* to this influence." When used in this manner, they are called *participial nouns*.

RULES FOR FORMING PARTICIPLES FROM REGULAR  
VERBS.

The *Imperfect participle* is formed by adding *ing* to the verb; as, *call, calling*.

The *Perfect participle* is formed by adding *d* to verbs that end in silent *e*; as, *love, loved*; and *ed* to verbs that end in any other letter; as, *call, called*.

But Verbs ending in silent *e*, on assuming *ing*, omit the *e*; as, *love, loving*.

*Exception 1.* *Singeing, swingeing, and dyeing*, the *imperfect* participles of *singe, swinge, and dye*, retain the *e*, to distinguish them from *singing, swinging, and dying*, the participles of *sing, swing, and die*.

*Exception 2.* Verbs ending in *ie* omit the *e*, and change the *i* into *y* before *ing*; as, *Tie, tying*.

Verbs of one syllable ending in a *single* consonant, preceded by a *single* vowel, [or by *two* vowels, if the first is *u*,] on assuming *ing* or *ed*, double the *final* consonant; as, *Ship, shipping, shipped; Quit, quitting, quitted*.

*Exceptions.* *Suit, suiting, suited; bruit, bruiting, bruited*

Verbs ending in a *single* consonant, preceded by *more than one* vowel [unless the one before the last be *u* or *w*,] do not double the *final* consonant, on assuming *ing*; as, *Load, loading, loaded; Swab, swabbing, swabbed*.

*Exception.* *Recruit, recruiting, recruited*.

Verbs of more than one syllable ending in a *single* consonant, preceded by a *single* vowel, [or by *two*

vowels, if the first is *u* or *w*,] and having the accent on the *last* syllable, *double* the *final* consonant, on assuming *ing* or *ed*; as, *Defer*, *deferring*, *deferred*; *Acquit*, *acquitting*, *acquitted*.

Verbs of more than one syllable ending in a *single* consonant, preceded by a *single* vowel, and *not* accented on the last syllable *do NOT double* the final consonant on assuming *ing*; as, *Recover*, *recovering*; *Quiet*, *quieting*.

*Note.* The affix from *quiet* seems to contradict or form an exception to the Rule, as the final consonant is preceded by more than one vowel; but the Rule applies only to the last syllable, which contains no more than one vowel.

Verbs ending in *y*, preceded by a *consonant*, change the *y* into *i* on assuming *ed*; as *Study*, *studied*.

Verbs ending in *y*, preceded by a *vowel*, on assuming *ed*, do not change the *y*; as, *Journey*, *journeyed*.

Verbs ending in *ee*, omit the latter *e*, on assuming *ed*; as, *agree*, *agreed*; *fee*, *feed*.

Verbs ending in *c* assume *k* before *ing* and *ed*; as, *Frolic*, *frolicking*, *frolicked*; *Mimic*, *mimicking*, *mimicked*; *Traffic*, *trafficking*, *trafficked*.

*Shoe* makes *shocing*; *Hoe*, *hoeing*, *hoed*; *Eye*, *eying*, *eyed*.

The following words ought *not* to double the final consonant when a termination is added:

*Apparel*, *barrel*, *benefit*, *bias*, *bigot*, *billet*, *buffet*, *cancel*, *carol*, *cavil*, *channel*, *counsel*, *cudgel*, *dial*, *drivel*, *duel*, *equal*, *fillet*, *gallop*, *gambol*, *gibbet*, *gossip*, *gravel*, *grovel*, *handsel*, *jewel*, *kennel*, *kidnap*, *level*, *libel*, *limit*, *marshal*, *marvel*, *model*, *parallel*, *parcel*,

*pencil, pommel, quarrel, revel, rival, rivet, shovel, shrivel, snivel, trammel, travel, wainscot and worship.*

---

## ON "SHALL" AND "WILL."

In *affirmative* sentences, *shall*, in the first person, simply foretells ; as, "I *shall* write." In the second and third persons, *shall* is used potentially, denoting a *promise, command, or determination* ; as, "You *shall* be rewarded ;" "Thou *shalt* not kill ;" "He *shall* be punished." *Will*, in the first person, is used potentially, denoting *promise or determination* ; as, "I *will* go at all hazards." In the second and third persons, *will* simply foretells ; as "You *will* soon be there ;" "He *will* expect you."

In *interrogative* sentences, *shall*, in the first person, may either be used potentially to inquire the will of the person addressed, as, "Shall I bring you another book ?" or it may simply ask whether a certain event will occur ; as, "Shall I arrive in time for the train ?" When *shall* is used interrogatively in the second person, it simply denotes futurity ; as, "Shall you be in Edinburgh next week ?" *Shall*, employed interrogatively in the third person, has a potential signification, and is used to inquire the will of the person addressed ; as, "Shall John order the carriage ?" *Will*, used interrogatively in the second person, is potential in its signification ; as, "Will you go ?" *Will* may be used interrogatively in the third person, to denote mere futurity ; as, "Will the boat leave to-day ?" Or it may have a potential signification, inquiring the will of the per-



son spoken of; as, “ *Will* he hazard his life for the safety of his friend ?”

In the *subjunctive mood*, *shall*, in all the persons, denotes mere futurity; as, “If thy brother *shall* trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault.”

*Will*, on the contrary, is potential in its signification, having respect to the will of the agent or subject; as, “If he *will* strive to improve, he shall be duly rewarded.”

---

### ON IRREGULAR VERBS.

The following list comprises nearly all the simple irregular verbs in our language.

When more forms than one are used in the past tense, or perfect participle, that which stands first is to be preferred.

Compound verbs [except *welcome* and *behave*, which are regular] are conjugated like the simple verbs, from which they are formed; as, *foresee, foresaw, foreseen*.

### LIST OF IRREGULAR VERBS.

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Past</i>	<i>Perf. Part.</i>
Abide	Abode	Abode
Am	Was	Been
Awake	Awoke, Awaked	Awaked
Bear	Bore	Born
[to bring forth]		
Bear, <i>for-</i>	Bore	Borne
[to sustain]		
Beat	Beat	Beaten, Beat
Begin	Began	Begun



<i>Present.</i>	<i>Past.</i>	<i>Perf. Part.</i>
Bend, <i>un-</i>	Bent, Bended.	Bent, Bended
Bereave	Bereft, Bereaved	Bereft, Bereaved
Beseech	Besought	Besought
Bid, <i>for-</i>	Bade, Bid	Bid
Bind, <i>un- re-</i>	Bound	Bound
Bite	Bit	Bitten, Bit
Bleed	Bled	Bled
Blow	Blew	Blown
Break	Broke	Broken
Breed	Bred	Bred
Bring	Brought	Brought
Build, <i>re- up-</i>	Built, Builded	Built, Builded
Burst	Burst	Burst
Buy	Bought	Bought
Cast	Cast	Cast
Catch	Caught, Catched	Caught, Caught
Chide	Chid	Chid
Choose	Chose	Chosen
Cleave [to adhere]	Cleaved	Cleaved
Cleave [to split]	Clave, Cleft	Cleft
Cling	Clung	Clung
Clothe	Clothed	Clothed
Come, <i>be- over-</i>	Came	Come
Cost	Cost	Cost
Creep	Crept	Crept
Crow	Crew, Crowed	Crowed
Cut	Cut	Cut
Dare*	Dared, Durst	Dared
[to venture]		
Deal	Dealt	Dealt

\* *Dare*, to challenge, is regular.

<i>Pres.</i>	<i>Past.</i>	<i>Perf. Part.</i>
Dig	Dug	Dug
Do,	Did	Done
<i>un-, mis-, over-</i>		
Draw, <i>with-</i>	Drew	Drawn
Drink	Drank	Drunk
Drive	Drove	Driven
Dwell	Dwelt, Dwelled	Dwelt, Dwelled
Eat	Ate	Eaten
Fall, <i>be-</i>	Fell	Fallen
Feed	Fed	Fed
Feel	Felt	Felt
Fight	Fought	Fought
Find	Found	Found
Flee	Fled	Fled
Fly	Flew	Flown
Fling	Flung	Flung
Forsake	Forsook	Forsaken
Freeze	Froze	Frozen
Get, <i>be, for-</i>	Got	Got
Gild	Gilt, Gilded	Gilt, Gilded
Gird,	Girt, Girded	Girt, Girded
<i>be-, un-, en-</i>		
Give, <i>for-, mis-</i>	Gave	Given
Go, <i>for-, under-</i>	Went	Gone
Grave, <i>en-</i>	Graved	Graved
Grind	Ground	Ground
Grow	Grew	Grown
Have	Had	Had
Hang*	Hung	Hung

\* *Hang*, to take away life by hanging, is regular ; as, " *Judas departed, and went and hanged himself.*"

<i>Pres.</i>	<i>Past.</i>	<i>Perf. Part.</i>
Heave*	Heaved, Hove	Heaved, Hoven
Hear, <i>over-</i>	Heard	Heard
Hew	Hewed	Hewn, Hewed
Hide	Hid	Hidden, Hid
Hit	Hit	Hit
Hold,	Held	Held
<i>be-, with-, up-</i>		
Hurt	Hurt	Hurt
Keep	Kept	Kept
Kneel	Knelt	Knelt
Knit	Knit, Knitted	Knit, Knitted
Know, <i>fore-</i>	Knew	Known
Lade	Laded	Laded
Load, <i>un-, over-</i>	Loaded	Loaded
Lie†	Lay	Lain
[to lie down]		
Lay	Laid	Laid
[to place], <i>in-</i>		
Lead, <i>mis-</i>	Led	Led
Leave	Left	Left
Lend	Lent	Lent
Let	Let	Let
Light	Lighted, Lit	Lighted, Lit
Lose	Lost	Lost
Make	Made	Made
Mean	Meant, Meaned	Meant, Meaned
Meet	Met	Met
Mow	Mowed	Mown, Mowed

\* The irregular past tense and perfect participle of this verb are employed in sea language ; but the latter rarely.

† *Lie*, to tell a falsehood, is regular.

<i>Pres.</i>	<i>Past.</i>	<i>Perf. Part.</i>
Pay, <i>re-</i>	Paid	Paid
Pen [to enclose]*	Penned, Pent	Penned, Pen
Put	Put	Put
Quit	Quitted, Quit	Quit, Quitted
Read	Read	Read
Rend	Rent	Rent
Rid	Rid	Rid
Ride	Rode	Ridden
Ring	Rang, Rung	Rung
Rise, <i>a-</i>	Rose	Risen
Rive	Rived	Riven
Run, <i>out-</i>	Ran	Run
Saw	Sawed	Saw, Sawed
Say, <i>un-, gain-</i>	Said	Said
See, <i>fore-</i>	Saw	Seen
Seek	Sought	Sought
Sell	Sold	Sold
Seethe	Seethed, Sod	Seethed
Send	Sent	Sent
Set, <i>be-</i>	Set	Set
Sit	Sat	Sat
Shake	Shook	Shaken
Shed	Shed	Shed
Shine	Shone	Shone
Shoe	Shod	Shod
Shoot, <i>over-</i>	Shot	Shot
Shew or Show	Shewed or Showed	Shewn or Shown
Shred	Shred	Shred
Shrink	Shrunk	Shrunk

\* *Pen*, to write, is regular.

<i>Pres.</i>	<i>Past.</i>	<i>Perf. Part.</i>
Shut	Shut	Shut
Sing	Sang, Sung,	Sung
Sink	Sank, Sunk	Sunk
Slay	Slew	Slain
Sleep	Slept	Slept
Slide	Slid	Slid
Sling	Slung	Slung
Slink	Slunk	Slunk
Slit	Slit	Slit
Smite	Smote	Smitten
Sow	Sowed	Sown, Sowed
Speak, <i>be-</i>	Spoke	Spoken
Speed	Sped	Sped
Spend, <i>mis-</i>	Spent	Spent
Spill	Spilt, Spilled	Spilt, Spilled
Spin	Spun	Spun
Spit*	Spit	Spit
Split	Split	Split
Spread, <i>over-, be-</i>	Spread	Spread
Spring	Sprang, Sprung	Sprung
Stand, <i>with-, under-</i>	Stood	Stood
Steal	Stole	Stolen
Stick	Stuck	Stuck
Sting	Stung	Stung
Stink	Stank, Stunk	Stunk
Stride, <i>be-</i>	Strode	Stridden
Strike	Struck	Struck
String	Strung	Strung
Strive	Strove	Striven

\* *Spit*, to put on a spit, is regular.

<i>Pres.</i>	<i>Past.</i>	<i>— Perf. Past.</i>
Strow or Strew, <i>be-</i>	Strowed, Strewed	Strown, Strowed Strewn, Strewed
Swear, <i>for-</i>	Swore	Sworn
Sweat	Sweated	Sweated
Sweep	Swept	Swept
Swell	Swelled	Swelled, Swollen
Swim	Swam, Swum	Swum
Swing	Swung	Swung
Take, <i>mis-, under-</i> <i>be-, re-, over-,</i>	Took	Taken
Teach, <i>un-, mis-</i>	Taught	Taught
Tear	Tore	Torn
Tell, <i>fore-</i>	Told	Told
Think, <i>be-</i>	Thought	Thought
Thrive <small>NOON</small>	Throve, Thrived	Thriven, Thrived
Throw, <i>over-</i>	Threw	Thrown
Thrust	Thrust	Thrust
Tread, <i>re-</i>	Trod	Trodden
Wear	Wore	Worn
Weave, <i>un-</i>	Wove	Woven
Weep	Wept	Wept
Win	Won	Won
Wind, <i>un-</i>	Wound	Wound
Wring	Wrung	Wrung
Write	Wrote	Written

*Obs.* When the past tense is a monosyllable not ending in a single vowel, the second person singular of the solemn style is formed by the addition of *est*; as, *hearest, fleddest, lookest. Hadst, wast, saidst, and didst*, are exceptions.



N.B. The words *beholden*, *bounden*, *cloven*, *drunken*, *graven*, *laden*, *molten*, *sodden*, *shaven*, *shorn*, *sunken*, *stricken*, *stringed*, and *wrought*, which were formerly used as perfect participles, are now used only as adjectives.

---

### CORRESPONDING CONJUNCTIONS.

1. Some conjunctions are composed of two corresponding words. The following list embraces most of this class of connectives, and exhibits the correct mode of employing them:—

*Both—and*: “It is the work of a mind fitted *both* for minute researches *and* for large speculations.”—*Macaulay*.

*Though, although—yet, still, nevertheless*: “*Though* deep, *yet* clear—*though* gentle, *yet* not dull;”—“*Though* a thousand rivers discharge themselves into the ocean, *still* it is never full.”

*Whether—or*: “*Whether* it were I *or* they.”

*Either—or*: “No leave ask’st thou of *either* wind *or* tide.”

*Neither—nor*: “*Neither* act *nor* promise hastily.”

2. Some conjunctions are used in correspondence with adverbs or adjectives. The following are the principal connectives of this class:—

*As—as, so*: “She is *as* amiable *as* her sister;”—“*As* he excels in virtue, *so* he rises in estimation.”

*So—as*: “No riches make one *so* happy *as* a clear conscience;”—“Speak *so as* to be understood.”

*So—that*, expressing a consequence: “She speaks *so* low *that* no one can hear what she is saying.”

*Not only—but, but also* : “He was *not only* prudent, *but also* industrious.”

*Such—as* : “There never was *such* a time as the present.

*Such—that* : “*Such* is the emptiness of human enjoyment *that* we are always impatient of the present.”

*More, sooner, &c.—than* : “They have *more than* heart could wish;”—“The Greeks were *braver than* the Persians.”

## MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS.

ON POINTS, THAT OCCASION DIFFICULTY TO THE STUDENT.

1. The letters *w* and *y* are consonants, when they precede a vowel in the same syllable : as in *wine*, *twine*, *youth*—in other situations they are vowels.

2. *A* and *An* are one and the same article. *A* is used, whenever the following word begins with a consonant—as, *A* man, *a* tree; or with an *aspirated h*—as, *a* house, *a* horse; or, with a *consonant sound* —as, *such a* one, *a* university, *a* ewe, *a* eulogy. N.B. The words *university*, *ewe*, and *eulogy*, begin with the consonant sound of *y*, and the word *one* with the consonant sound of *w*.

*An* is used, whenever the following word begins with a vowel—as, *an* army, *an* ounce; or, with an *h not sounded*—as, *an* hour, *an* heir.

*An* is also employed by most writers before words beginning with an *aspirated h*, when the accent falls on the *second* syllable—as, “*An* historical piece;”

“*An* hereditary government;” “*An* harmonious whole.”

*A* or *an* is the Saxon word *ane* or *an*, signifying *one*.

3. The *possessive case* denotes *ownership* or *possession*: as, “*John’s* book”—“*The sun’s* rays.”

The possessive singular of nouns is generally formed by adding an apostrophe, with the letter *s*, to the nominative: as, nom. *man*; poss. *man’s*.

The possessive of singular nouns ending in the sound of *s* or *z*, is sometimes formed by adding only the apostrophe; as, “*Achilles’* shield.” In poetry, this omission of the additional *s* must be regarded as fully sanctioned by usage. It is also allowable in prose, when the use of the *s* would require the utterance of several hissing sounds in rapid succession; as, “*Moses’* disciples”—“*Davies’* Surveying”—“For *conscience’* sake”—“For *righteousness’* sake”—but, say, “*The witness’s* testimony.” In all other cases the regular form is to be preferred; as, “*Collins’s* Odes”—“*Erasmus’s* Dialogues.”

“*Achilles’* shield his ample shoulders spread,  
*Achilles’* helmet nodded o’er his head.”—*Pope*.  
 “A train of heroes followed through the field,  
 Who bore by turns great *Ajax’* seven-fold shield.”

*Ibid.*

Plural nouns ending in *s*, form the possessive by adding an apostrophe only; as, nom. *fathers*: poss. *fathers’*.

Plural nouns, that do not end in *s*, form the possessive by adding both the apostrophe and *s*; as,

nom. *men*; poss. *mens*. The import of the possessive may, in general, be expressed by the particle *of*. Thus, for "*man's* wisdom," we may say, "The wisdom *of man*."

When the singular and plural are alike in the nominative, the apostrophe ought to follow the *s* in the plural, to distinguish it from the singular; as "a *sheep's* head;" "*sheeps'* heads."

The sign *'s* is a contraction of *es* or *is*. Thus *man's*, *king's*, were formerly written *manes* or *manis*, *kinges* or *kingis*.

N. B. The Rev. Dr. M'Culloch, in his admirable "Manual of English Grammar," says—"It has been supposed that the termination [*'s*] of the English possessive is a contraction of the possessive pronoun *his*. Thus—'John's book' has been said to be an abbreviation of 'John his book.' But this opinion is evidently erroneous. The termination [*'s*] cannot always be resolved into the pronoun *his*. We cannot resolve 'queen's crown' into 'queen *his* crown,' or 'children's bread' into 'children *his* bread.' The fact seems to be, that the English possessive termination is one of the parts of our language, which we have preserved from the Saxon. The casual termination of the Saxon possessive is *es* or *is*, as appears in such phrases as '*Godes sight*,' '*kingis crown*.' The progress of change in the termination seems to have been *es*, *is*, '*s*.'"

Several respectable authors and critics have fallen into the error of regarding this possessive termination as a contraction of the pronoun *his*. "The same single letter [*s*], on many occasions, does the

office of a whole word, and represents the *his* or *her* of our forefathers.”—*Addiscn.*

It is true that the word *his* was frequently written after words to form the possessive, by Spenser, Dryden, Pope, and other popular authors, during a period of two or three centuries, as, “*Christ his sake*”—“*Socrates hīs rules* ;” but the present contracted form of the possessive was in use still earlier, and our ablest philologists have uniformly referred its origin to the old Saxon termination.

4. Adjectives have three degrees of comparison :—the *positive*, the *comparative*, and the *superlative* ; but it has been objected to the positive form, that, as it denotes the quality in its simple state, without increase or diminution, it cannot properly be called a *degree*. It should, however, be borne in mind that all adjectives imply a *general* comparison of qualities. Thus, when we say that a man is discreet, we obviously mean that he has more discretion than the generality of men. So also when we say that a man is tall, it is implied that he is tall compared with other men. Hence arises the difference between the height of a tall man and that of a tall tree, each being compared with others of the same kind. In this sense, therefore, the positive is strictly and properly a *degree* of comparison.

The following adjectives are compared irregularly :—

<i>Positive.</i>	<i>Comparative.</i>	<i>Superlative.</i>
Good,	Better,	Best,
Bad, evil, or ill,	Worse,	Worst,



<i>Positive.</i>	<i>Comparative.</i>	<i>Superlative.</i>
Far,	Further, Farther,	Farthest, Furthest.
Late,	Later,	Latest, [ <i>referring to time.</i> ] Last, [ <i>in order.</i> ]
Little,	Less,	Least.
Much, <i>or</i> many,	More,	Most.
Near,	Nearer,	Nearest, [ <i>Refer- ring to place.</i> ] Next [ <i>in order.</i> ]
Old,	Older, Elder,	Oldest, Eldest,

N. B. *Elder* and *eldest* are applied to persons; and, according to the best usage, only in comparing members of the same family. Thus—an *elder* brother, the *eldest* sister: but—Wellington was little *older* than Napoleon; the *oldest* street in the town.—*D'Orsey.*

Some adjectives in the superlative degree are formed by adding *most* to the comparative, or to the word, from which the comparative itself is made; as, *hind*, *hinder*, *hindermost* or *hindmost*: *nether*, *nethermost*: *up*, *uppermost* or *upmost*: *in*, *innermost*, or *inmost*.

Diminution of quality is expressed by *less* and *least*, whether the adjective be of one syllable or more than one; as, *bold*, *less bold*, *least bold*.

5. There seems to be no good reason for joining *an* and *other*. *An* here excludes any other article: and analogy and consistency require that the words be separated. Their union has sometimes led to an



improper repetition of the article; as, “Another such *a* man,” for “An other such man.”

6. The pronoun *you* was originally plural in signification, but it is now universally employed in popular discourse to represent either a singular or a plural noun.

No usage of our language is more fully established than that, which recognizes *you* as the representative of nouns in the singular number.

*Brightland*, one of the earliest of our English grammarians, who wrote in 1710, classes *you* with the singular pronouns *I*, *thou* and *he*. *Greenwood*, in his celebrated grammar, which appeared the following year, says—“*Thou* or *you* is of the second person singular.” The same opinion was entertained by many other grammatical writers of the last century.

Lindley Murray’s Grammar first appeared in 1795. Following the practice of the Society of Friends,—the community, in which he was educated,—he restricted *you* to the plural number; and such was the influence of his example that this word was, for a time, very generally excluded from the list of singular pronouns.

There has, however, always existed a respectable class of authors, who have treated this pronoun *you* as singular, when used to personate an individual: and, during the last forty years, the number of this class has very rapidly increased.

“It is altogether absurd to consider *you* as exclusively a plural pronoun in the modern English language. It may be a matter of *history*, that it was

originally used as a plural only : and it may be a matter of *theory*, that it was first applied to individuals on a principle of flattery : but the *fact* is, that it is now our second person singular. When applied to an individual, it never excites any idea either of plurality or of adulation : but excites, precisely and exactly, the idea, that was excited by the use of *thou*, in an earlier stage of the language."

—*Jeffrey, in the Edinburgh Review.*

"If a word, once exclusively plural, becomes, by universal use, the sign of individuality, it must take its place in the singular number. That this is the fact with *you*, is proved by national usage."—*Webster.*

7. The "*Society of Friends*" profess to use *thou* in addressing a single individual—many of them, however, [perhaps from an idea that it is less formal,] misemploy *thee* for *thou*, and often join it to the third person of the verb, instead of the second. Such expressions as "*thee does, thee is, thee has, thee thinks,*" &c., are double solecisms ; they set all grammar at defiance. We have, however, in Scripture, an instance of similar inaccuracy : "For thou shalt eat the labor of thine hands ; O well is thee [that is to say, O thee is well,] and happy shalt thou be."—*Psalms cxxviii. 2. Prayer Book Translation.*

8. Never say "*I have come*"—"He *has* risen"—"*They were once in good circumstances, but have now fallen*"—but "*I am come*"—"He *is* risen"—"*They were, &c., but are now fallen.*"

9. We nearly always see *can* and *not* written as

one word : thus, *cannot*. This is not always correct. The rule for the junction or non-junction is very simple : When power is denied, *can* and *not* are united to prevent ambiguity : as, “ I *cannot* go.” But when the power is affirmed, and something else is denied, the words are written separately : as, “ The Christian apologist *can* not merely expose the utter baseness of the infidel assertion, but he has also positive ground for erecting an opposite and confronting assertion in its place.”

10. When adjectives are connected, and the qualities belong to things individually different, though of the same name, the article should be repeated : as, “ *A* black and *a* white horse.”

When adjectives are connected, and the qualities all belong to the same thing or things, the article should not be repeated : as, “ *A* black and white horse.” N.B. By a repetition of the article before several adjectives in the same construction, a repetition of the noun is implied ; but without a repetition of the article the adjectives are confined to one and the same noun.

To avoid repetition, inconsistent qualities are sometimes joined to a plural noun : as, “ The old and new testaments,” for “ *The* old and *the* new testament.”

11. *Were* is sometimes used for *would be* or *should be* : as, “ Ah ! what *were* man should Heaven refuse to hear ? ”

*Had* is also occasionally employed for *would have* or *should have* : as, “ I *had* not known sin but by the law.”

12. The verb *need* is often used in the third person singular of the indicative present, without the personal termination: as, "The truth *need* not be disguised:" "There was one condition, which *need* not be mentioned."

13. When the article *a* or *an* is placed before the words *few* or *little*, it generally changes their meaning from negative to positive. Thus, when we say, "There were *few* persons present," the word *few* is used in a *negative* sense, in distinction from *many*, to denote the smallness of the number. But when we say, "There were *a few* persons present," the word *few* is used in a *positive* sense, in distinction from *none*, to denote that there were some persons present. The expressions, "He needs *little* aid," and "He needs *a little* aid," serve also to illustrate this remark.

14. When two nouns following a comparative refer to different persons or things, the article should be repeated before the second noun: but when the two nouns refer to the same person or thing, the article should not be repeated. Thus, in the sentence, "He is a better soldier than a scholar," the terms *soldier* and *scholar* relate properly to different individuals, and it is implied that he is a better soldier than a scholar would be. But, in the sentence, "He is a better soldier than scholar," the terms *soldier* and *scholar* are limited to one individual, and it is implied that he is better in the capacity of a soldier than in that of a scholar.

15. Adjectives, that imply unity or plurality, must agree with their nouns in number: as, "*That* sort;" "Those sorts." Never say, "Those *sort* of persons"—a very common expression.

16. When the adjective is necessarily plural, the noun should be made so too : as, “Twenty *pounds*,” not “Twenty *pound* :” a very common mistake. N.B. In some peculiar phrases, however, this rule appears to be disregarded ; as, “*Two hundred penny-worth* of bread is not sufficient.” *John* vi. 7.—“*Twenty sail* of vessels.”—“A *hundred head* of cattle.”

17. The noun *means* has the same form in both numbers : it should, therefore, be used with an adjective of the singular or plural number, as the sense requires : as, “By *this means* they bear witness to each other.” *Mean*, in this sense, is not in good use.

18. When the comparative degree is employed, the latter term of comparison should never include the former : as, “*Iron* is more useful than *all the metals*.” It should be, “than *all the other metals*.”

19. When the superlative degree is employed, the latter term of comparison should never exclude the former : as, “A *fondness* for show is, of all *other follies*, the most vain.” The word *other* should be expunged.

20. An explanatory clause should never be inserted between a positive noun and the word by which it is governed. The following sentence is faulty in this respect :—“She began to extol the farmer’s, as she called him, excellent understanding.” It should be, “She began to extol the excellent understanding of the farmer, as she called him.”

21. The pronoun *who* should not be used to represent a name, which is taken merely as a word. Thus, “The court of Queen Elizabeth, *who* was but



another name for prudence and economy," should be, "The court of Queen Elizabeth, *whose* name was but another word for prudence and economy."

22. The word *what* should not be used for the conjunction *that*, nor *that* for the compound relative *what*, that is to say, for the relative pronoun *what*, as equivalent in signification to *that which*, or *those which*. The following sentences are in this respect faulty:—"They would not believe but *what* he was guilty:"—"We speak *that* we do know, and testify *that* we have seen."

23. *What* is sometimes used adverbially, in the sense of *partly*, or *in part*: as, "*What* with 'wooding' at two or three places, and *what* with the excitement of the day, we were too fatigued to give more than a glance and a passing note of admiration to the beauty of the scene."

24. Relatives should be so placed as to prevent all ambiguity in regard to the words which they are intended to represent. The following sentence is, therefore, objectionable:—"He is unworthy of the confidence of a fellow-being *that* disregards the laws of his Maker." Corrected:—"He *that* disregards the laws of his Maker is unworthy of the confidence of a fellow-being."

"I am the man, who command you." This sentence is ambiguous, and may be corrected in two different ways. If *who* is intended to refer to *I*, we should say, "I, who command you, am the man." But if *who* is intended to refer to *man*, then we should say, "I am the man who commands you."

25. In familiar language the relative is sometimes



improperly omitted. Thus, "He is a man I greatly esteem," should be, "He is a man *whom* I greatly esteem." So, also, "I am dissatisfied with the manner I have spent my time," should be, "I am dissatisfied with the manner *in which* I have spent my time."

26. *Whatever* is sometimes employed merely for the purpose of rendering a word or phrase emphatic: as, "No condition *whatever*."

27. In order to determine, in difficult cases, whether an adjective or an adverb is required, the student should carefully attend to the definition of these parts of speech, and consider whether, in the case in question, *quality* or *manner* is to be expressed: if the former, an adjective is proper: if the latter, an adverb. The following examples will illustrate this point: "She looks *cold* :—she looks *coldly* on him." "I sat *silent* :—I sat *silently* musing." "Stand *firm* :—maintain your cause *firmly*."

28. The pronominal adjectives, *each*, *every*, *either*, and *neither*, are always in the third person singular; and when they are the leading words in their clauses, they require verbs and pronouns to agree with them accordingly: as, "*Each* of you *is* entitled to *his* share."

29. *Either* and *neither* relate to two things only: when more are referred to, *any* and *none* should be used instead of them: as, "*Any* of the three"—not "*Either* of the three." "*None* of the four"—not "*Neither* of the four."

30. *Which*, as well as *who*, was formerly applied to persons; as, "Our *Father, which* art in heaven."

It may still be applied to a young child: as, "The child *which* died."

31. Nouns of multitude, unless they express persons directly as such, should not be represented by the relative *who*: to say, "The *family*, *whom* I visited," would hardly be proper: *that* would here be better. When, however, such nouns are strictly of the neuter gender, the pronoun *which* may represent them: as, "The committees *which* were appointed."

32. An adverb should not be used, where a preposition and a relative pronoun would better express the relation of the terms: as, "A cause *where* justice is so much concerned:" say, "*in which* justice," &c.

33. Where a pronoun or a pronominal adjective will not express the meaning clearly, the noun must be repeated. In the following sentence the meaning is not clearly expressed: "we see the beautiful variety of colour in the rainbow, and are led to consider the cause of *it*," say, "the cause of that variety."

34. The relative *that* may be applied either to persons or to things. In the following cases it is preferable to *who* or *which*:—1. After an adjective of the superlative degree: as, "He was the *first*, *that* came."—2. After the adjective *same*: as, "This is the *same* person *that* I met before."—3. After the antecedent *who*: as "Who, *that* has common sense, can think so?"—4. After a joint reference to persons and things: as, "He spoke of the *men* and *things*, *that* he had seen."—5. After an unlimited antecedent: as, "*Thoughts*, *that* breathe, and *words*,

*that* burn.”—6. After an antecedent introduced by the expletive *it*: as, “*It is you, that* command.” “*It was I, that* did it.”—7. And, in general, where the propriety of *who* or *which* is doubtful: as, “The little child, *that* was placed in the midst.”

35. A collective noun conveying the idea of unity, requires a noun in the third person singular, neuter: as, “The *nation* will enforce *its* laws.”

Most collective nouns of the neuter gender may take the regular plural form, and be represented by a pronoun in the third person plural, neuter: as, “The *nations* will enforce *their* laws.”

36. The adjuncts of the nominative do not control its agreement with the verb: as, “Six months’ *interest was* due.”—“The *propriety* of these rules *is* evident”—“The *mill*, with all its appurtenances, *was* destroyed.”

37. *Either* is occasionally employed by good writers in the sense of *each*: as, “On *either* side the giant guards divide.”—*Southey*. “The Sabine hills and the Albanian mountains stretch on *either* hand.”—*Irving*. N. B.—This practice, however, should be carefully avoided.

38. In the use of comparative and superlative adjectives, care should be taken not to include a noun or pronoun in a class, to which it does not belong, nor exclude it from a class, to which it does belong. Thus, it would be improper to say, “Socrates was wiser than any Athenian,” because Socrates was himself an Athenian, and could not be wiser than himself. The correct form would be, “Socrates was wiser than any *other* Athenian,” or, “Socrates was

the wisest of the Athenians." The following sentence is also erroneous:—"The vice of covetousness, of *all others*, enters deepest into the soul." Covetousness is not one of the *other* vices, as the construction of the sentence would imply. Corrected:—"Of all the vices, covetousness enters deepest into the soul."

39. The word "*self*," when used alone, is a noun: as, "The love of *self* is predominant."

40. Double comparatives and superlatives, as *worser*, *most straitest*, should be carefully avoided.

The word *lesser* is, however, sometimes employed by good writers: as, "Of *lesser* note."—*Goldsmith*. "Lesser *graces*."—*Blair*. "Like *lesser* streams."—*Coleridge*.

41. The verbs *need* and *want* are sometimes employed in a general sense, without a nominative, expressed or implied: as "There *needed* a new dispensation of religion for the moral reform of society."—*Eveleigh*. "There *needs* no better picture of his destitute and piteous situation, than that furnished by the homely pen of the chronicler."—*Irring*. "Wheresoever the case of the opinions came in agitation, there *wanted* not patrons to stand up and plead for them."—*Sparks*.

"Nor did there *want*  
Cornice, or frieze, with bossy sculptures graven."  
*Milton*.

42. Idiomatic expressions sometimes occur, in which intransitive verbs are followed by objectives depending on them: as "Perhaps we have wanted

the spirit, the manliness, to *look* the *subject* fully in the face.”—*Channing*. “They *laughed* him to scorn.”—*Matt.* ix. 24.

“The broken soldier, kindly bid to stay,  
Sat by his fire, and *talk'd* the *night* away.”  
*Goldsmith.*

43. The verb *learn* is often improperly used for *teach* : as, “It is of little utility *to learn* scholars that certain words are signs of certain moods and tenses.” Insert *teach* in the place of *learn*.

44. The imperfect participle of a transitive verb is sometimes employed in a passive sense : as “The fortress was *building*.”

Different opinions have long existed among critics respecting this passive use of the imperfect participle. Many respectable writers substitute the compound passive participle : as, “The house is *being built* :”—“The book is *being printed*.” The prevailing practice, however, of the best authors, is in favour of the simple form : as, “The house is *building*.”

“The propriety of these imperfect passive tenses has been doubted by almost all our grammarians : though I believe but few of them have written many pages without condescending to make use of them. Dr. Beattie says, ‘One of the greatest defects of the English tongue, with regard to the verb, seems to be the want of an imperfect passive participle.’—And yet he uses the imperfect participle in a passive sense as often as most writers.”—*Pickbourn’s “Dissertation on the English Verb.”*



A distinguished Reviewer thus expresses himself in reference to this point: "Several other expressions of this sort now and then occur, such as the new-fangled and most uncouth solecism '*is being done*,' for the good old English idiomatic expression '*is doing*,'—an absurd periphrasis, driving out a pointed and pithy turn of the English language."

45. When the nominative is a collective noun conveying the idea of plurality, the verb must agree with it in the plural number: as, "The council *were* divided."

46. When a verb has nominatives of different persons or numbers, connected by *or* or *nor*, it must agree with that which is placed nearest to it, and be understood to the rest, in the person and number required: as, "Neither he nor his brothers *were* there."—"Neither you nor I *am* concerned."

But when the nominatives require different forms of the verb, it is, in general, more elegant to express the verb, or its auxiliary, in connexion with each of them: as, "Either thou *art* to blame, or I *am*."—"Neither *were* their numbers, nor *was* their destination known,"

47. The speaker should generally mention himself last; as, "Thou or I must go;"—"He then addressed his discourse to my father and *me*."—But in confessing a fault he may assume the first place: as, "*I* and Robert did it."

48. Participles have the same government as the verbs from which they are derived. The preposition *of*, therefore, should not be used after the participle, when the verb does not require it. Thus, in



phrases like the following, *of* is improper: “Keeping *of* one day in seven;”—“By preaching *of* repentance;”—“They left off beating *of* Paul.”

When participles are compounded with something that does not belong to the verb, they become adjectives; and as such, they cannot govern an object after them. The following sentence from “*Janes’s Church History*,” is, therefore, inaccurate: “When Caius did anything *unbecoming* his dignity.”

When a transitive participle is converted into a noun, *of* must be inserted to govern the object following.

An imperfect or a compound participle, preceded by an article, an adjective, or a noun or pronoun in the possessive case, becomes a verbal noun; and as such, it cannot govern an object after it. A word, which may be the object of the participle in its proper construction, requires the preposition *of*, to connect it with the verbal noun: as, 1. [By the participle.] “By *exercising* the body, health is promoted.” 2. [By the verbal noun.] “By *the exercising of* the body, health is promoted.” Again: 1. [By the participle.] “Much depends on *observing* this rule.” 2. [By the verbal noun.] “Much depends on *their observing of* this rule.”

When the use of the preposition produces ambiguity or harshness, the expression must be varied. Thus—the sentence, “He mentions *Newton’s writing of* a commentary,” is both ambiguous and awkward. If the preposition be omitted, the word *writing* will have a double construction, which is inadmissible. Some would say, “He mentions *Newton writing* a

commentary." This is still worse, because it makes the leading word in sense the adjunct in construction. The meaning may without difficulty be correctly expressed. Thus: "He mentions *that Newton wrote* a commentary."—"By *his* studying the Scriptures he became wise." Here *his* serves only to render the sentence incorrect.

49. The verbal noun should not be accompanied by any adjuncts of the verb or participle, unless they be taken into composition: as, "The hypocrite's hope is like the *giving-up* of the ghost." The following phrase is therefore inaccurate: "For the *more easily* reading of large numbers."—Yet, if we say, "For reading large numbers *the more easily*," the construction is different, and not inaccurate.

50. In sentences like the following, the participle seems to be improperly made the object of the verb: "I intend *doing* it."—"I remember *meeting* him."—Better, "I intend *to do* it."—"I remember *to have met* him."

51. A participle construed after the nominative or the objective case, is not equivalent to a verbal noun governing the possessive. There is sometimes a nice distinction to be observed in the application of these two constructions, as the leading word in sense should not be made the adjunct in construction. The following sentences exhibit a disregard to this principle, and are both inaccurate: "He felt his strength's declining."—"He was sensible of his strength declining." In the former sentence the noun *strength* should be in the objective

case, governed by *felt* ; and in the latter, in the possessive, governed by *declining*.

52. When the infinitive follows the transitive verbs *bid*, *dare*, *feel*, *see*, *let*, *make*, *need*, and *hear*, the sign *to* is usually omitted : as, “I *felt* my strength *return* :”—“Nothing *need be said* :”—“We *heard* the thunder *roll* :”—“Pride guides his steps, and *bids* him *shun* the great.”

The sign of the infinitive is also omitted, in some instances, after the verbs *have*, *behold*, *observe*, *perceive*, *know*, and *help* : as, “Would they *have* us *reject* such an offer ?”

53. In the use of verbs, those tenses alone should be employed which correctly express the sense intended.

Although this rule is somewhat indefinite, yet when taken in connection with the definitions and illustrations of the tenses, that are given in many grammars, it will, in most cases, be a sufficient guide to the student. It is violated in the following example :—“After I *visited* Europe I returned to America.” The verb *visited* in this sentence relates to a time previous to that denoted by the verb *returned*. It should, therefore, be in the past perfect tense. Corrected :—“After I *had visited* Europe I returned to America.”—“I expected *to have seen* you,” is also incorrect. The verb “*to have seen*” cannot here relate to a time prior to that denoted by the verb “*expected*.” It should not, therefore, be in the past perfect tense. Corrected :—“I expected *to see* you.”

54. *Never* is sometimes improperly used for *ever* :

as, "They might be extirpated, were they *never* so many." Corrected:—"They might, &c., were they *ever* so many."

55. A negation is properly expressed by the use of one negative only. The following sentence is therefore erroneous:—

"I never did repent for doing good,  
Nor shall *not* now."—*Shakspeare*.

56. Two negatives in the same clause are generally equivalent to an affirmative, and are sometimes elegantly employed to express a positive assertion: as, "The pilot was *not* *unacquainted* with the coast:"—"Nor did he pass *unmoved* the gentle scene." The intervention of *only*, or some other word of kindred meaning, preserves the negation: as, "He was *not* *only* illiberal, but covetous."

57. A repetition of the same negative renders the negation more emphatic: as, "I would *never* lay down my arms:—*never, never, never*."—*Pitt*.

58. The adverb *no* is often improperly used for *not*: as, "Whether he will or *no*, he must be a man of the nineteenth century."—*Macaulay*.

59. Adverbs should be placed in that situation which contributes most to the harmony and clearness of the sentence, and which accords best with the usage of the language. This rule is violated in the sentence, "Thoughts are *only* criminal when they are first chosen and then voluntarily continued."—*Johnson*. As it now stands, the adverb *only* properly qualifies *criminal*, whereas the author intended to have it qualify the clause following *when*.

Corrected:—"Thoughts are criminal *only* when they are first chosen, and then voluntarily continued." The following sentence is also faulty:—"It is *not* the business of virtue to extirpate the affections of the mind, but to regulate them."

Corrected:—"The business of virtue is *not* to extirpate the affections of the mind, but to regulate them."

60. An adverb should not be placed immediately after the infinitive particle *to*. This rule is violated in the following sentence:—"Teach scholars to *carefully* scrutinize the sentiments advanced in all the books they read:" say "Teach scholars to scrutinize *carefully*," &c., or "*carefully* to scrutinize," &c.

61. *Than* should be used to correspond with *rather*, and with all *comparatives*. The clause following *other* is also more properly introduced by *than*, though good writers occasionally employ some other term. N.B. "In the Book of Common Prayer we have, 'Thou shalt have no *other* gods *but* me : ' and the same expression occurs in Addison, Swift, and other contemporary writers. Usage, however, seems of late to have decided almost universally in favour of *than*."—*Dr. Crombie*.

62. The conjunction *so* is occasionally used in the sense of *if* or *provided that* : as, "It signifies little whether it be very well executed or not, *so* it be reasonably well done, and without any glaring omissions or errors."—*Lord Brougham*.

63. The word *both* should not be used with reference to more than two objects or classes of ob-



jects. The following example is, therefore, erroneous:—"He paid his contributions to literary undertakings, and assisted *both* the Tatler, Spectator, and Guardian."—*Johnson*. *Both* should be omitted.

64. The conjunction *as*, used in connection with an adjective or adverb in the positive degree, is sometimes improperly coupled with a comparative, and followed by *than*: as, "The latest posterity will listen with *as much* or even *greater* pleasure *than* their contemporaries."—*Everett*. Corrected:—"The latest posterity will listen with as much pleasure as their contemporaries, or even greater."

65. A preposition and its object should be so placed as to leave no ambiguity in regard to the words which the preposition is intended to connect. The following sentence is faulty in this respect:—"The message was communicated by an agent, who had never before discharged any important office of trust, *in compliance* with the instructions of the executive." *In* is here intended to show the relation between *was communicated* and *compliance*; whereas the present arrangement indicates that it expresses the relation between *had discharged* and *compliance*. Corrected:—"The message was communicated *in compliance* with the instructions of the executive, by an agent who had never before discharged any important office of trust."

66. Care should be taken to employ such prepositions as express clearly and precisely the relations intended: as "He went *to* Glasgow:"—"He arrived *at* Liverpool:"—"He rode *into* the country:"



—"He resides *in* London:"—"He walks *with* a staff *by* moonlight:"—"The mind is sure to revolt *from* the humiliation *of* being thus moulded and fashioned, *in* respect to its feelings, *at* the pleasure of another."—*Whately*.

67. *But* is sometimes employed as a preposition, in the sense of *except*: as,

"The boy stood on the burning deck,  
Whence all *but* him had fled."—*Hemans*.

68. "*O'clock*" is an elliptical expression, contracted from "*Of the clock*:"—"At seven *of the clock*."—*Spectator*. "*By five of the clock*."—*Shakspere*.

69. The preposition *into* expresses a relation produced by motion or change: and *in*, the same relation, without reference to motion: hence, "to walk *into* the garden," and, "to walk *in* the garden," are very different.

70. *Between* or *betwixt* is used in reference to two things or parties: *among* or *amidst*, in reference to a greater number, or to something, by which another may be surrounded: as,

"Thou pendulum *betwixt* a smile and tear."—*Byron*.  
"The host *between* the mountain and the shore."—*Id*.

"To meditate *amongst* decay, and stand  
A ruin *amidst* ruins."—*Byron*.

71. Two separate prepositions have sometimes a joint reference to the same noun: as "He boasted *of*, and contended *for*, the privilege." This construction is formal, and scarcely allowable, except

in the law style. It is better to say, "He boasted of the privilege, and contended for it."

72. By the customary [but faulty] omission of the negative before *but*, that conjunction has acquired the adverbial sense of *only*: and it may, when used with that signification, be called an adverb. Thus the text, "He hath *not* grieved me but in part, [2 Cor. ii. 5] might drop the negative and convey the same meaning: "He hath grieved me *but* in part."

"Reason itself *but* gives it edge and power."—*Pope*.  
 "Born *but* to die, and reasoning *but* to err."—*Idem*.

73. A noun, governing the possessive plural, should not be made plural, unless the sense require it. Thus: say, "We have changed our *mind*," if only one purpose or opinion is meant.

A noun, taken figuratively, may be singular, when the literal meaning would require the plural: such expressions as "Their *face*"—"Their *neck*"—"Their *hand*"—"Their *head*"—"Their *heart*"—"Our *mouth*"—"Our *life*"—are frequent in the Scriptures, and are not improper.

74. Never say, "*He* was paid the *money*," but, "*The money* was paid *him*."

75. The adjective *worth* is followed by the objective case, governed, perhaps, by *of* understood: as, "The book is *worth* a sovereign." Some suppose that *worth* in this construction is a noun, and that there is a double ellipsis of the preposition: as, "The book is [of the] *worth* [of] a sovereign." After the kindred adjectives *worthy* and *unworthy*,

*of* should be expressed: as, “It is worthy *of* remark.”—“It is unworthy *of* notice.” *Worth* was anciently a verb signifying *be*, and was used in every part of the conjugation. Some traces of this usage are found in modern writings: as,

“Wo *worth* the chase, wo *worth* the day,  
That cost thy life, my gallant gray!”—*Scott*.

Here *worth* is a verb, and *to* is understood after it: the meaning being, “Wo *be to* the chase,” &c.

76. In connecting words, that express time, the order and fitness of time should be observed. Thus: instead of, “I *have seen* him *last week*,” say, “I *saw* him *last week* :” and instead of, “I *saw* him *this week*,” say, “I *have seen* him *this week*.”

77. Verbs of *commanding*, *desiring*, *expecting*, *hoping*, *intending*, *permitting*, and some others, in all their tenses refer to actions or events, relatively present or future: one should, therefore, say “I *hoped* you *would come*,”—not “*would have come* :” and, “I *intended to do it*,”—not, “*to have done it* :” &c.

78. Propositions, that are at all times equally true or false, should generally be expressed in the present tense: as, “He *seemed hardly to know* that two and two make four,”—not, “*made*.”

79. Idiomatic expressions sometimes occur, in which a transitive verb is used intransitively in a sense nearly allied to the passive: as, “The goods *sell* rapidly :”—“The cloth *tears* :”—“Mahogany *planes* smooth :”—“These lines *read* well.”

80. When two or more personal pronouns in the

second person are employed in the same connection, they should be made to correspond in style. The following passages are, therefore, inaccurate:—

1. "Enjoy *your* dear wit, and gay rhetoric,  
That hath so well been taught her dazzling fence :  
*Thou* art not fit to hear *thyself* convinced."—*Milton*.

N.B. *Your* should be *thy*, to correspond with *thou* and *thyself*.

2. "As in that loved Athenian bower,  
*You* learned an all-commanding power,  
*Thy* mimic soul, O nymph endear'd,  
Can well recall what then it heard."—*Collins*.

N.B. *Thy* should be *your*, to correspond with *you*.

81. We sometimes find adverbs used after the manner of nouns : as, "The Son of man hath not *where* to lay his head."—*Matt.* viii. 20. "The Son of God—was not *yea* and *nay*, but in him was *yea*."—*2 Cor.* i. 10. "An eternal *now* does always last." *Cowley*. "To say *aye* and *no* to every thing I said!—*Aye* and *no* too was no good divinity!"—*Shakspeare*. "Till *now* they had paid no taxes."—*Inglis*. "On the following day Columbus came to *where* the coast swept away to the north-east for many leagues."—*Irving*. "Save *where* the beetle wheels his droning flight."—*Gray*. "Till *then*, who knew the force of those dire arms?"—*Milton*.

N.B. *At once*, and *by far*, are in general use; and the adverbial phrases *from hence*, *from thence*, *from whence*, constitute an authorized idiom. Such expressions, however, as *from where*, *from there*, *to here*, *from far*, *since when*, *since then*, *till now*, are

seldom employed by the best prose writers. In poetry, their occurrence is more frequent.

82. In former times, the infinitive was sometimes preceded by *for* as well as *to*; as, "I went up to Jerusalem *for to* worship."—*Acts* xxiv. 11. "What went ye out *for to* see?"—*Luke* vii. 26.

"Learn skilfullie how  
Each grain *for to* laie by itself on a mow."

*Tusser.*

Modern usage rejects the former preposition.

83. A singular nominative and an objective after *with* are sometimes made to form the joint subject of a plural verb; as, "Pharaoh with all his host *were* drowned in the Red Sea." This copulative use of *with* is occasionally adopted by good writers; it would, however, be better, in most cases, either to put *and* in the place of *with*, or to employ the singular form of the verb. Thus—instead of saying "This noble ship, *with* her gallant crew, *were* buried beneath the waves," it would be better to say—"This noble ship *and* her gallant crew *were* buried beneath the waves." So, also—"This brave officer, with a company of only fifty men, *have* succeeded in quelling the insurrection," would be better expressed by saying, "This brave officer, with a company of only fifty men, *has* succeeded in quelling the insurrection."

"*Examples* :—"This principle, with others of the same kind, *supposes* man to act from a brute impulse."—*Johnson*. "He himself, with others, *was* taken."—*Moore*. "A body of two thousand



men succeeded in surprising the quarters of the Marquis of Cadiz, who, with his followers, *was* exhausted by fatigue and watching.”—*Prescott*.

“This phraseology,” says Dr. Crombie, “though not strictly consonant with the rules of concord, frequently obtains both in ancient and modern languages; in some cases, indeed, it seems preferable to the syntactical form of expression.”

84. In a familiar question or negation the compound form of the verb is preferable to the simple; as, “*Does he come* to town every week?” Not “*Comes he* to town,” &c? But in the solemn or the poetic style, the simple form is more dignified and graceful; as, “*Understandest* thou what thou readest?” “Of whom *speaketh* the prophet this?”—*Acts* viii. 30, 34. “What! *Heard* ye not of lowland war?”—*Scott*.

85. Some grammarians object to the use of the numerals *two, three, four, &c.*, before the adjectives *first* and *last*. There seems, however, to be no good reason for the objection, and the expressions *two first, three last, &c.*, are fully sanctioned by good usage.

*Examples*:—“My *two last* letters.”—*Addison*. “The *two first* lines are uncommonly beautiful.”—*Blair*. “At the *two last* schools.”—*Johnson*. “The *four first* are altogether and unequivocally poetical.”—*Cheever*. “The *three first* of his longer poems.”—*Southey*.

The expressions *first three, last two, &c.*, are also in good use, and, in some cases, are to be preferred.

*Examples*:—“The *first eighteen* years.”—



*Robertson*. "The history of the world for the *last fifty* years."—*Everett*. "During the *last seven* or *eight* years."—*Brougham*.

N.B.—"It has been fashionable of late to write the *first three*, and so on, instead of the *three first*. Persons write in this way to avoid the seeming absurdity of implying that more than *one* thing can be the *first*; but it is, *at least*, equally absurd to talk about the *first four*, when [as often happens] there is no *second four*."—*Arnold*. "Surely, if there can be only '*one last*,' '*one first*,' there can be only '*a last one*,' '*a first one*.' I need only observe that usage is decidedly in favor of the former phraseology."—*Grant*. "The only argument against the use of *two first*, and in favor of substituting *first two*, so far as I can recollect, is this: In the nature of things, there can be only *one first* and *one last*, in any series of things. But—is it true that there can never be more than *one first* and *one last*? If it be so, then the adjectives *first* and *last* must always be of the *singular* number, and can never agree with nouns in the plural. We are told that the *first years* of a lawyer's practice are seldom very lucrative. The poet tells us that his *first essays* were severely handled by the critics, but his *last efforts* have been well received. Examples like these might be produced without number. They occur everywhere in all our standard writers. . . . When a numeral adjective and a qualifying epithet both refer to the same noun, the *general rule* of the English language is to place the numeral first, then the qualifying epithet, and afterwards the noun.

Thus we say, 'the *two wise* men,' 'the *two tall* men;' and not 'the *wise two* men,' 'the *tall two* men.' And the same rule holds in *superlatives*. We say 'the *two wisest* men,' 'the *two tallest* men;' and not 'the *wisest two* men,' 'the *tallest two* men.' Now if this be admitted to be the general rule of the English language, it then follows that we should generally say, 'the *two first*,' 'the *two last*,' &c., rather than 'the *first two*,' 'the *last two*,' &c. This, I say, should *generally* be the order of the words. Yet there are some cases in which it seems preferable to say, 'the *first two*,' 'the *first three*,' &c."—*Dr. Murdock*.

86. "Of the two forms, '*him excepted*' and '*he excepted*,' the former [contrary to the sentiment of the majority of grammarians] is the correct one."—*Latham*.

87. *His* was formerly employed as the possessive both of *he* and *it*.

*Examples* :—"Put up again thy sword into *his* place."—*Matt.* xxvi. 52. "Learning hath *his* infancy, when it is but beginning, and almost childish."—*Bacon*.

N.B.—"The possessive *its* does not appear before the seventeenth century."—*Booth*. "*Its* is not found in the Bible, except by misprint."—*Brown*.

88. *Who* is usually applied to persons only; *which*, though formerly applied to persons, is now confined to animals and inanimate things; *what* [as a mere pronoun] is applied to things only; *that* is applied indifferently to persons, animals or things.

89. The word *than* was formerly used as a pre-

position, and still retains this character in the phrase *than whom*; as, "Beelzebub, *than whom*, Satan except, none higher sat."—*Milton*.

OBS.—The phrase *than which* is also sometimes used in a similar manner; as, "A work *than which* the age has certainly produced none more sure of bequeathing its author's name to the admiration of future times."—*Russell*.

90. The second person singular of the simple verb *do* is now usually written *dost*; being contracted in orthography as well as in pronunciation. This anomaly seems unnecessary. In the words *undoest* and *overdoest* no contraction takes place.

91. *An* is sometimes a *conjunction* signifying *if*; as, "Nay, *an* thou'lt mouthe, I'll rant as well as thou."—*Shakspeare*.

92. To express a reciprocal action or relation, the pronominal adjectives *each other* and *one another* are employed; as, "They love *each other*;"—"They love *one another*." The words separately considered are singular; but taken together, they imply plurality; and they can be properly construed only after plurals, or singulars taken conjointly. *Each other* is usually applied to two objects; and *one another* to more than two. The terms, though reciprocal and closely united, are never in the same construction. If such expressions be analyzed, *each* and *one* will generally appear to be in the nominative case, and *other* in the objective; as, "They love *each other*;" that is, *each* loves *the other*. *Each* is properly in apposition with *they*, and *other* is governed by the verb. The terms, however, admit

of other constructions ; as, “Be ye helpers *one* of *another*.”—*Bible*. Here *one* is in apposition with *ye*, and *another* is governed by *of*. “Ye are *one another’s* joy.”—*Bible*. Here *one* is in apposition with *ye*, and *another’s* is in the possessive case, being governed by *joy*. “Love will make you *one another’s* joy.” Here *one* is in the objective case, being in apposition with *you*, and *another’s* is governed as before. The Latin terms *alius*, *alium*, *alii*, *alios*, &c., sufficiently confirm this doctrine.

93. When the verb has different forms, that form should be adopted which is the most consistent with present and reputable usage, in the style employed ; thus, to say familiarly, “The clock *hath stricken* ;” “Thou *laughedst* and *talkedst* when thou *oughtest* to have been silent ;”—“He *readeth* and *writeth*, but he *doth* not cipher,” would be no better than to use *don’t*, *won’t*, *can’t*, *shan’t*, and *didn’t* in preaching.

94. *Adjectives* should be employed to qualify *nouns* and *pronouns*, and *adverbs* to modify *verbs*, *adjectives*, and other *adverbs*. It is therefore incorrect to say, “She writes *elegant* ;”—“Thine *often* infirmities.”

95. Conjunctions should not be unnecessarily accumulated ; as, “*But* *AND* *if* that evil servant shall say in his heart,” &c.—*Matt.* xxiv. 48.

96. Those verbs and participles which require a regimen, should not be employed without it ; as, “She endeavored to *ingratiate* [*herself*] with the family ;”—“I will not *allow of* it.” Leave out *of*.

97. Those verbs and participles which do not admit a regimen should not be used transitively ; as,

"The planters *grow* cotton:" say *raise*, or *cultivate*.

N.B.—Some verbs, however, may govern a kindred noun, or its pronoun, but no other; as, "He *lived* a virtuous life;"—"Hear, I pray you, this *dream which* I have dreamed."—*Gen.* xxxvii. 6.

98. *Beside* should be used as a preposition, and *besides* only as an adverb.

99. Passive verbs of *asking*, *giving*, *teaching*, and some others, are often employed to govern a noun or pronoun in the objective.

*Examples*:—"He *was asked* his opinion."—*Johnson*.

"They *were denied* the indulgence."—*Macaulay*.

"He *was taught* the science in its strictly logical form;"—"They *had been refused* shelter;"—"And all *are taught* an avarice of praise."—*Goldsmith*.

100. There are some verbs which may be used either transitively or intransitively; as, "He *will return* in a week;"—"He *will return* the book;"—"The wind *blows* violently;"—"The wind *blows* the chaff."

101. *Mussulmen* is used by many writers as the plural of *Mussulman*, which is decidedly incorrect. We say *Frenchmen*, *Dutchmen*, *Irishmen*, &c., and not *Frenchmans*, *Dutchmans*, *Irishmans*, because *Frenchman*, *Dutchman*, and *Irishman* are respectively compounded of *French* and *man*, *Dutch* and *man*, *Irish* and *man*, and because *men* is the plural of *man*. But, as to the word *Mussulman*, though it may be a compound in the Arabic, in which language it signifies a believer in the true religion, yet



considered as an English word, it is not compounded, but simple, as we have no such word as *Mussul* in the English tongue.

It is the same with the words *Ottoman* and *German*, which, considered as English words, are not compounded, whatever they may be in the countries where they were coined. We, therefore, say *Ottomans* and *Germans* in the plural; and no one ever yet took it into his head to say *Ottomen* or *Ger-men*.

We ought, on the same principle, to say *Mussulmans* in the plural, and not *Mussulmen*.

102. *Co-* ought to be used only when the word with which it is joined begins with a vowel, as in *co-eval*, *co-existent*, *co-incident*, *co-operate*, &c. *Con-*, when the word begins with a consonant, as in *contemporary*, *conjuncture*, &c. There is but one exception, which is *co-partner*.

103. *Extemporary* is preferable as an adjective to *extempore*, which is properly an adverb, and ought, for the sake of precision, to be confined to that use. Thus we say with propriety, an *extemporary prayer*, an *extemporary sermon*; but, he *prays extempore*, he *preaches extempore*. On the same principle, *scarcely* as an adverb ought to be preferred to *scarce*, which is an adjective; and *exceedingly* as an adverb, to *exceeding*, which is a participle.

104. When *this* and *that* are used in the sense of *former* and *latter*, *this* and *these* correspond with *latter*, *that* and *those* with *former*.

*Examples*:—"Religion raises men above themselves; irreligion sinks them beneath the brutes;



*this* [irreligion] binds them down to a pitiable speck of earth, *that* [religion] opens for them a prospect to the skies."

"The palaces and lofty domes arose ;

*These* for devotion, and for pleasure *those*."

Pope.

## HINTS ON THE CURRENT IMPROPRIETIES OF EXPRESSION IN WRITING AND SPEAKING,

WITH RULES FOR THEIR CORRECTION.

1. SOME people speak of "so many *spoonsfull*," instead of "so many spoonfuls." The rule on this subject says, "Compounds ending in *ful*, and all those in which the principal word is put last, form the plural in the same manner as other nouns ; as "handfuls, spoonfuls, mouthfuls," etc., etc.

Logic will demonstrate the propriety of this rule : —Are you measuring by a plurality of spoons ? If so, "so many *spoonsfull*" must be the correct term ; but if the process of measuring be effected by *re-filling the same spoon*, then it becomes evident that the precise idea meant to be conveyed is, the *quantity* contained in the vessel by which it is measured, which is a "*spoonful*."

### CURRENT IMPROPRIETIES OF EXPRESSION.

2. It is a common mistake to speak of "a disagreeable effluvia." This word is effluvium in the singular, and effluvia in the plural. The same rule should be observed with automaton, arcanum, erratum, phenomenon, memorandum, and several others which are less frequently used, and which change

the *um* or *on* into *a*, to form the plural. It is so common a thing, however, to say *memorandums*, that I fear it would sound a little pedantic, in colloquial style, to use the word *memoranda*; and it is desirable, perhaps, that custom should make an exception of this word, as well as of *encomium*, and allow two terminations to it, according to the taste of the speaker and the style of the discourse: *memorandums* or *memoranda*, like *encomiums* or *encomia*.

3. We have heard *pulse* and *patience* treated as pluralities, much to our astonishment.

4. It seems to be a position assumed by all grammarians, that their readers already understand the meaning of the word "case," as applied to nouns and pronouns; hence, they never enter into a clear explanation of the simple term, but proceed at once to a discussion of its grammatical distinctions, in which it frequently happens that the student, for want of a little introductory explanation, is unable to accompany them. But I am not going to repeat to the scholar how the term "case" is derived from a Latin word signifying "to fall," and is so named because all the other cases *fall* or *decline* from the nominative, in order to express the various relations of nouns to each other—which in Latin they do by a difference of termination, in English by the aid of prepositions; and that an orderly arrangement of all these different terminations is called the declension of a noun, etc., etc. etc. I am not going to repeat to the scholar the things he already knows; but to you, my gentle readers,

to whom Latin is still an unknown tongue, to whom grammars are become obsolete things, and grammatical definitions would be bewildering preliminaries, "more honoured in the breach than in the observance"—to you I am anxious to explain, in the clearest manner practicable, all the mysteries of this case, because it was a cruel perplexity to myself in days of yore. And I will endeavour to make my lecture as brief and clear as possible, requesting you to bear in mind that no knowledge is to be acquired without a little trouble ; and that whosoever may consider it too irksome a task to exert the understanding for a *short* period, must be content to remain in inexcusable and irremediable ignorance. Though I doubt not, when you come to perceive how great the errors are which you daily commit, you will not regret having sat down quietly, for half an hour, to listen to an unscholastic exposition of them.

5. We all understand the meaning of the word "case," as it is applied to the common affairs of life ; but when we meet with it in our grammars we view it as an abstruse term ; we won't consent to believe that it means nothing more than *position of affairs, condition, or circumstances*, any one of which words might be substituted for it with equal propriety, if it were not indispensable in grammar to adhere strictly to the same term when we wish to direct the attention unerringly to the same thing, and to keep the understanding alive to the justness of its application ; whilst a multiplicity of names to one thing would be likely to create confusion.

Thus, if one were to say "this is a very hard case;" or "a singular case occurred the other day;" or "that poor man's case is a very deplorable one;" we should readily comprehend that by the word "case" was meant circumstance," or "situation;" and when we speak, in the language of the grammar, of "a noun in the nominative case," we only mean a person or thing placed in such circumstances as to become merely named, or named as the performer of some action; as "the man;" or "the man walks." In both these sentences, "man" is in the nominative case; because, in the first he is simply *named*, without reference to any circumstance respecting him; and in the second he is named as the performer of the *act* of *walking* mentioned. When we speak of a noun in the possessive case, we simply mean a person or thing placed under such circumstances as to become named as the *possessor* of something; and when we speak of a noun in the objective case, we only intend to express a person or thing standing in such a situation as to be, in some way or other, affected by the act of some other person or thing; as, "Henry teaches Charles." Here Henry is, by an abbreviation of terms, called *the nominative case* (instead of the *noun* in the nominative case), because he stands in that situation in which it is incumbent on us to name him as the *performer* of the act of teaching; and Charles is, by the same abbreviating license, called the *objective case*, because he is in such a position of affairs as to *receive* the act of teaching which Henry performs. I will now tell you how you may always

distinguish the three cases : read the sentence attentively, and understand accurately what the nouns are represented as doing : if any person or thing be represented as *performing* an *action*, that person or thing is a noun in the nominative case ; if any person or thing be represented as *possessing something*, that person or thing is a noun in the possessive case ; and if any person or thing be represented as neither performing nor possessing, it is a noun in the objective case, whether directly or indirectly affected by the action of the nominative, because as we have in English but *three* cases, which contain the substance of the *six Latin* cases, *whatever is neither nominative or possessive must be objective*. Here I might wander into a long digression on passive and neuter verbs, which I may seem to have totally overlooked in the principle just laid down ; but I am not writing a Grammar, nor attempting to illustrate the various ramifications of grammatical laws to people who know nothing at all about them—any more than I am writing for the edification of the accomplished scholar to whom purity of diction is already familiar. I am writing, chiefly, for that vast portion of the educated classes who have never looked into a grammar since their school-days were over, but who have ingeniously hewn out for themselves a middle path between ignorance and knowledge, and to whom certain little hillocks in their way have risen up, under a dense atmosphere, to the magnitude of mountains : I merely wish to give to them, since they will not take the trouble to search for themselves, one broad



and general principle, unclogged by exceptions, to guide them to propriety of speech; and, should they afterwards acquire a taste for grammatical disputation, they will of course apply to more extensive sources for the necessary qualifications.

6. It is scarcely possible to commit any inaccuracy in the use of these cases when restricted to nouns, but in the application of them to pronouns a woful confusion often arises; though even in this confusion exists a marked distinction between the errors of the ill-bred and those of the well-bred man. To use the objective instead of the nominative is a *vulgar* error; to use the nominative instead of the objective is a *genteel* error. No person of decent education would think of saying "Him and me are going to the play." Yet how often do we hear even well-educated people say "They were coming to see my brother and *I*;" "The claret will be packed in two baskets for Mr. Smith and *I*;" "Let you and *I* try to move it;" "Let him and *I* go up and speak to them." "Between you and *I*," etc., etc. All faults as heinous as that of the vulgarian who says "Him and me are going to the play,"—and with less excuse. Two minutes' reflection will enable the scholar to correct himself, and a little exercise of memory will shield him from a repetition of the fault; but for the benefit of those who may *not* be scholars, we will accompany him through the mazes of his reflections. Who are the persons who are performing the act of "coming to see?" "*They*." Then the pronoun *they* must stand in the nominative case. Who are



the persons to whom the act of "coming to see" extends? "my brother and I." Then "my brother and I," being the *objects affected* by the act of the nominative, must be a noun and pronoun standing in the objective case; and as nouns are not susceptible of change on account of cases, it is only the *pronoun* which requires alteration to render the sentence correct: "They were coming to see my brother and *me*." The same argument is applicable to the other examples given. In no language is the imperative mood of a verb conjugated with a pronoun in the nominative case, therefore "Let you and *I* try to move it," "Let him and *I* go up and speak to them," are manifest improprieties. A very simple test may be formed by taking away the first noun or pronoun from the sentence altogether, and bringing the verb or preposition right against that pronoun which you use to designate yourself: thus, "They were coming to see *I*;" "The claret will be packed in two hampers for *I*;" "Let *I* try to move it," etc. By this means your own ear will correct you, without any reference to grammatical rules. And bear in mind that the number of *nouns* it may be necessary to press into the sentence will not alter the *case* respecting the pronouns.

"Between you and I," is as erroneous an expression as any: change the position of the pronouns, and say, "Between I and you;" or change the sentence altogether, and say "Between I and the wall there was a great gap;" and you will soon see in what case the first person should be ren-

dered. "Prepositions govern the objective case," therefore it is impossible to put a nominative *after* a preposition without a gross violation of a rule which ought to be familiar to everybody.

7. The same mistake extends to the relative pronouns "who" and "whom:" we seldom hear the objective case used either by vulgar or refined speakers. "Who did you give it to?" "Who is this for?" are solecisms of daily occurrence; and when the objective "whom" is used, it is generally put in the wrong place; as "The person whom I expected would purchase that estate;" "The man whom they intend shall execute that work." This intervening verb in each sentence, "I expected" and "they intend," coming between the last verb and its own nominative (the relative pronoun), has no power to alter the rule, and no right to violate it; but as the introduction of an intervening verb, in such situations, is likely to beguile the ear and confuse the judgment, it would be better to avoid such constructions altogether, and turn the sentence a different way; as "The person whom I expected *to be* the purchaser of that estate;" "The man whom they intend *to* execute that work." If the reader will cut off the intervening verb, which has nothing to do with the construction of the sentence except to mystify it, he will perceive at a glance the error and its remedy: "The person *whom* would purchase that estate;" "The man *whom* shall execute that work."

This fault is wholly chargeable upon the shoulders of the *educated idle*; for, except in interrogative

sentences, vulgar people generally use the relative "which" in both cases, and say, "The man *which* paid me the money;" "The man *which* the money was paid *to*."

8. But though illiterate people may say *which*, instead of *who* and *whom*, with impunity, there is something too repugnant to good taste, too derogatory to understanding, in the use of a superfluous "which," in such sentences as the following, from the lips of persons of respectable education: "I know a lady living at Richmond, who had two daughters, *which* the eldest married a captain in the navy;" "I was going to the bookseller's when I met Edward, *which* I had no idea he had returned to town." Will anybody have the kindness to explain the utility of this gratuitous "which?" When people have not had the opportunity of learning, ignorance is excusable; but in ladies and gentlemen who sin with their eyes open—"Oh! the offence is rank."

9. It is very easy to mistake the nominative when another noun comes between it and the verb, which is frequently the case in the use of the indefinite and distributive pronouns,—as "One of those houses *were* sold last week;" "Each of the daughters *are* to have a separate share;" "Every tree in those plantations *have* been injured by the storm;" "Either of the children *are* at liberty to claim it." Here it will be perceived that the pronouns "one," "each," "every," "either," are the true nominatives to the verbs; but the intervening noun in the plural number, in each sentence, deludes

the ear, and the speaker, without reflection, renders the verb in the plural instead of the singular number. The same error is often committed when no second noun appears to plead an apology for the fault; as "Each city *have their* peculiar privileges;" "Everybody has a right to look after *their* own interest;" "Either *are* at liberty to claim it." This is the effect of pure carelessness.

10. There is another very common error, the reverse of the last-mentioned, which is that of rendering the adjective pronoun in the *plural* number instead of the singular in such sentences as the following: "*These* kind of entertainments are not conducive to general improvement;" "*Those* sort of experiments are often dangerous." This error seems to originate in the habit which people insensibly acquire of supposing the prominent noun in the sentence (such as "entertainments" or "experiments") to be the noun qualified by the adjective "these" or "those;" instead of which it is "kind," "sort," or any word of that description *immediately following* the adjective, which should be so qualified, and the adjective must be made to agree with it in the singular number. We confess, it is not so agreeable to the ear to say "*This* kind of entertainments," "*That* sort of experiments;" but it would be easy to give the sentence a different form, and say "Entertainments of this kind;" "Experiments of that sort;" by which the requisitions of grammar would be satisfied, and those of euphony too.

11. But the grand fault, the glaring impropriety,

committed by "all ranks and conditions of men," rich and poor, high and low, illiterate and learned,—except, perhaps, one in twenty—and from which not even the pulpit or the bar is totally free—is the substitution of the active verb *lay* for the neuter verb *lie* (to lie down). The scholar *knows* that "active verbs govern the objective case," and therefore *demand* an objective case after them; and that neuter verbs *will not admit* an objective case after them *except* through the medium of a preposition: *he*, therefore, has no excuse for his error, it is a wilful one—for him the following is not written; and here I may as well say, once for all, that whilst I would *remind* the *scholar* of his lapses, my instructions and explanations are offered *only* to the class which requires them.

Murray has nicely divided active verbs into active-transitive and active-intransitive, leaving the term neuter to comprise those verbs which signify a state of existence *without* action; as "I sleep," "I sit," "I grow," "I lie," "I die," etc. The words transitive and *intransitive* seem to me to explain themselves, for it is natural to suppose that "transitive" or *transitory*, means *passing away*; and that "*intransitive*" means *not passing away*. The term active-transitive is applied only to such verbs as describe an action taking place *in one* person or thing *upon* or *towards* another person or thing, without requiring the aid of a preposition to express it, as "I love George." Here the act of loving is performed *by* me, but its effect is not confined *to* me, because it *passes over to* or *concerns*



George, who thereby stands in the objective case because he is the *object* affected by another person's act. You perceive, therefore, that "to love" is an active verb requiring an objective case after it; and will now know the meaning of the expression "active verbs govern the objective case," because, if I love at all, I must love *something* or *somebody*, I cannot love *nothing*.

An active *intransitive* verb is the very reverse of this, because, not admitting an objective case after it, unless preceded by a preposition, the action which the verb describes has no *object* on which immediately to fall or become *transferred to* (keep in mind the connexion between this word and *transitive*), as "I laugh." Here the act is confined to the source in which it originates; I cannot say "I laugh George;" or "I laugh you;" I am not obliged to find an objective case for it at all, I may laugh from an emotion of the mind, or I may laugh, as thousands daily do, and not know why. But if I am *disposed* to find an objective case for it, I cannot do it without the intervention of a preposition, an adverb, or some other part of speech, as "I laugh at such things," "I laugh heartily," etc.

The neuter verb obeys the same law as the active *intransitive*, as "I sit," or "I sit *on* a chair;" "I sleep," or "I sleep *uneasily*;" "I grow," or "I grow *very slowly*;" "I lie," or "I lie *down*;" "I lie *on* a sofa."

"To lay" is an active transitive verb, like *love*, *demanding* an objective case after it, *without the intervention of a preposition*. "To lie" is a neuter



verb, *not admitting an objective case after it, except through the intervention of a preposition* ;—yet this “perverse generation” *will* go on substituting the former for the latter. Nothing can be more erroneous than to say, as people constantly do, “I shall go and lay down.” The question which naturally arises in the mind of the discriminating hearer, is “*What* are you going to lay down? money, carpets, plans, or what?” for, as a transitive verb is used, an object is wanted to complete the sense. The speaker means, in fact, to tell us that he (himself) is going to *lie down*, instead of which he gives us to understand that he is going to *lay* down, or *put* down, something which he has not named, but which it is necessary to name before we can understand the sentence; and this sentence, when completed according to the rules of grammar, will never convey the meaning he intends. One might as well use the verb “to put” in this situation, as the verb “to lay,” for each is a transitive verb requiring an objective case immediately after it. If you were to enter a room, and, finding a person lying on a sofa, were to address him with such a question as “What are you doing there?” you would think it ludicrous if he were to reply “I am *putting* down;” yet it would not be more absurd than to say “I am *laying* down;” but custom, whilst it fails to reconcile us to the error, has so familiarised us with it, that we hear it without surprise, and good breeding forbids our noticing it to the speaker. The same mistake is committed through all the tenses of the verb: how often are

nice ears wounded by the following expressions, "My brother *lays* ill of a fever;" "The vessel *lays* in Brooklyn Docks;" "The books were *laying* on the floor;" "He *laid* on a sofa three weeks;" "After I had *laid* down, I remembered that I had left my pistols *laying* on the table." You must perceive that, in every one of these instances, the wrong verb is used; correct it, therefore, according to the explanation given: thus, "My brother *lies* ill of a fever;" "The vessel *lies* in Brooklyn Docks;" "The books were *lying* on the floor;" "He *lay* on a sofa three weeks." "After I had *lain* down, I remembered that I had left my pistols *lying* on the table."

It is probable that this error has originated in the circumstance of the present tense of the verb "to lay" being conjugated precisely like the imperfect tense of the verb "to lie;" for they are alike in orthography and sound, and different only in meaning; and in order to remedy the evil which this resemblance seems to have created, I have conjugated at full-length the simple tenses of the two verbs, hoping the exposition may be found useful; for it is an error which *must* be corrected by all who aspire to the merit of speaking their own language *well*.

VERB ACTIVE.		VERB NEUTER.	
<i>To lay.</i>		<i>To lie.</i>	
Present tense.		Present tense.	
I lay	} money, carpets, plans, —any <i>thing</i> .	I lie	} down, too long, on a sofa, —any <i>where</i> .
Thou layest		Thou liest	
He lays		He lies	
We lay		We lie	
You lay		You lie	
They lay		They lie	

VERB ACTIVE. <i>To lay.</i>		VERB NEUTER <i>To lie.</i>	
Imperfect tense.		Imperfect tense.	
I laid	} money, carpets, plans, —any <i>thing.</i>	I lay	} down, too long, on a sofa, —any <i>where.</i>
Thou laigest		Thou layest	
He laid		He lay	
We laid		We lay	
You laid		You lay	
They laid		They lay	
Present Participle, Laying.		Present Participle, Lying.	
Perfect Participle, Laid.		Perfect Participle, Lain.	

In such sentences as these, wherein the verb is used reflectively—"If I lay myself down on the grass I shall catch cold;" "He laid himself down on the green sward;" the verb "to lay" is with propriety substituted for the verb "to lie;" because the addition of the emphatic pronoun *myself*, or *himself*, constituting an objective case, and coming *immediately after* the verb *without the intervention of a preposition*, renders it necessary that the verb employed should be *active*, not *neuter*, because "active verbs govern the objective case." But this is the only construction in which "to lay" instead of "to lie" can be sanctioned by the rules of grammar.

12. The same confusion often arises in the use of the verbs *sit* and *set*, *rise* and *raise*. *Sit* is a neuter verb, *set* an active one; yet how often do people most improperly say, "I have *set* with him for hours;" "He *set* on the beach till the sun went down;" "She *set* three nights by the patient's bedside. "What did they *set*—potatoes, traps, or what?" for as an objective case is evidently implied by the use of an active verb, an object is indispensable to complete the sense. No tense whatever of

the verb "to sit" is rendered "set," which has but *one word* throughout the whole verb, except the active participle "setting;" and "sit" has but two words "sit" and "sat," therefore it is very easy to correct this error by the help of a little attention.

13. *Raise* is the same kind of verb as *set*: active-transitive, requiring an objective case after it; and it contains only two words, *raise* and *raised*, besides the active participle "*raising*." *Rise* is a neuter verb, not admitting an objective case; it contains two words, *rise* and *rose*, besides the two participles, *rising* and *risen*. It is improper, therefore, to say, "He *rose* the books from the floor;" "He *raises* the fruit as it falls;" "After she had *risen* the basket on her head," etc. In all such cases use the other verb *raise*. It occurs to me, that if people would take the trouble to reckon how many different words a verb contains, they would be in less danger of mistaking them; "lay" contains two words, "lay" and "laid," besides the active participle "laying;" "Lie" has also two words, "lie" and "lay," besides the two participles "lying" and "lain;" and from this second word "lay" arises all the confusion I have had to lament in the foregoing pages.

14. To the scholar I would remark, the prevalent impropriety of adopting the subjunctive instead of the indicative mood in sentences where doubt or uncertainty is expressed, although the former can only be used in situations in which "contingency and futurity" are combined. Thus, a gentleman, giving an order to his tailor, may say, "Make me a coat of a certain description, if it *fit* me well I will

give you another order," because the "fit" alluded to is a thing which the future has to determine; but when the coat is made and brought home, he cannot say, "If this cloth *be good* I will give you another order," for the quality of the cloth is *already* determined; the future will not alter it; it may be good, it may be bad, but whatever it *may be* it *already is*; therefore, as contingency only is implied, *without futurity*, it must be rendered in the indicative mood, "If this cloth *is good*," etc. We may with propriety say, "If the book be sent in time, I shall be able to read it to-night," because the sending of the book is an event which the *future* must produce; but we must not say, "If this book be sent for me, it is a mistake," because here the act alluded to is already performed—the book is come. I think it very likely that people have been beguiled into this error by the prefix of the conjunction, forgetting that conjunctions may be used with the indicative as well as with the subjunctive mood.

15. Some people use the imperfect tense of the verb "to go," instead of the past participle, and say, "I should have *went*," instead of "I should have gone." This is *not* a very common error, but it is a very great one, and I should not have thought it could come within the range of the class for which this book is written, but that I have heard the fault committed by people of even tolerable education; one might as well say, "I should have *was* at the theatre last night," instead of "I should



have *been* at the theatre," etc., as say, "I should have *went*," instead of "I should have *gone*."

16. Others there are who invert this error, and use the past participle of the verb "to do," instead of a tense of the verb, saying, "I done" instead of "I *did*." This is inadmissible. "I did it," or "I *have done* it," is a phrase correct in its formation, its application being, of course, dependent on other circumstances.

17. There are speakers who are *too refined* to use the past (or perfect) participle of the verbs "to drink" "to run," "to begin," etc., and substitute the *imperfect tense*, as in the verb "to go:" thus, instead of saying, "I have drunk," "he has run," "they have begun," they say, "I have *drank*," "he has *ran*," "they have *began*," etc. These are minor errors, I admit, still, nice ears detect them.

18. I trust it is unnecessary to warn any of my readers against adopting the flagrant vulgarity of saying "*don't* ought," and "*hadn't* ought," instead of "ought *not*."

19. Many people have an odd way of saying, "I expect," when they only mean "I think," or "I conclude;" as, "I expect my brother is gone to Richmond to-day;" "I expect those books were sent to New York last year." This is wrong: *expect* can only relate to *future* time, and must be followed by a future tense, or a verb in the infinitive mood: as, "I expect my brother *will go* to Richmond to-day;" "I expect *to find* those books were sent to New York last year." Here the introduc-

tion of a future tense, or of a verb in the infinitive mood, rectifies the grammar without altering the sense: but such a portion of the sentence must not be omitted in expression, as no such ellipsis is allowable.

20. The majority of speakers use the imperfect tense and the perfect tense together, in such sentences as the following: "I intended to *have called* on him last night;" "I meant to *have purchased* one yesterday;" or a pluperfect tense and a perfect tense together, I have sometimes heard, as, "You should *have written to have told* her." These expressions are illogical, because, as the *intention* to perform an act *must* be *prior* to the act contemplated, the act itself cannot with propriety be expressed by a tense indicating a period of time *previous* to the intention. The three sentences should be corrected thus, placing the second verb in the infinitive-mood, "I intended *to call* on him last night;" "I meant *to purchase* one yesterday;" "You should have written *to tell* her."

But the imperfect tense and the perfect tense are to be combined in such sentences as the following: "I remarked, that they appeared to have undergone great fatigue;" because here the act of "undergoing fatigue" *must* have taken place *previous* to the period in which you have had the opportunity of remarking its effect on their appearance; the sentence, therefore, is both grammatical and logical.

21. Another strange perversion of grammatical propriety is to be heard occasionally in the adop-

tion of the present tense of the verb "to have," most probably instead of the past participle, but in situations in which the participle itself would be a redundancy; such as, "If I had *have* known;" "If he had *have* come according to appointment;" "If you had *have* sent me that intelligence," etc. Of what utility is the word "have," in the sentence at all? What office does it perform? If it stands in place of any other word, that *other* word would still be an incumbrance; but the sentence being complete without it, it becomes an illiterate superfluity. "If I had *have* known that you would have been there before me, I would have written to you to *have* waited till I had *have* come." What a construction from the lips of an educated person! and yet we do sometimes hear this *slip-slop* uttered by people who are considered to "speak French and Italian *well*," and who enjoy the reputation of being "accomplished!"

Though not at all disposed to be malicious, I cannot avoid being often forcibly reminded of Byron's description of a Spanish Blue:—

"She knew the Latin—that is, "The Lord's Prayer;"  
 And Greek—the Alphabet—I'm nearly sure;  
 She read some French romances here and there,  
 Although her mode of speaking was not pure;  
 For *native Spanish* she had *no great care*,  
 At least her conversation was obscure,"—

If our own language is so mean and insignificant as to be unworthy a little attention, why do we not banish it from good society altogether—speak French and German in common conversation, and

leave vulgar English to the "canaille?" We confess ourselves, as a nation, under great obligations to those men of genius and erudition who have assisted to purify and extend our language, and who have raised it gradually to its present standard of elegance and refinement, but our own share of the obligations will be *small* if we *will not* avail ourselves of the benefit of their exertions. And is it demanding too much of the educated, to inquire that they should speak correctly that language which the accomplished natives of other countries take infinite pains to acquire? Is it being too fastidious, "too particular," to suggest attention to these nice distinctions of right and wrong, of purity and corruption, in those to whom we have a right to look for models of English eloquence? If so; if it is *impossible* to exercise the perfection of the scholar without the affectation of the pedant, then aim not at a change which would only alter your condition without improving it—for it would be better to commit all the errors which this little book denounces, than *stiffen into pedantry*.

22. It is amusing to perceive the broad line of demarcation which exists between *vulgar* bad grammar, and *genteel* bad grammar, and which characterises the violation of almost every rule of syntax. The vulgar speaker uses adjectives instead of adverbs, and says, "This letter is written *shocking*;" the genteel speaker uses adverbs instead of adjectives, and says, "This writing looks *shockingly*." The perpetrators of the latter offence may fancy they can shield themselves behind the grammatical

law which compels the employment of an adverb, not an adjective, to qualify a verb ;—and behind the first rule of syntax, which says “ a verb must agree with its nominative ; ”—but which *is* the nominative in the expression alluded to ? *which* performs the act of looking—the writing or the speaker ? To say that a thing *looks* when *we* look *at* it, is an idiom peculiar to our language, and some idioms are not reducible to rules ; they are conventional terms which pass current, like bank-notes, for the sterling they represent, but must not be submitted to the test of grammatical alchemy. It is improper, therefore, to say “ The Queen looks beautifully ; ” “ The flowers smell sweetly ; ” “ This writing looks shockingly ; ” because it is the speaker that performs the act of looking, smelling, etc., not the noun looked *at* ; and though, by an idiomatical construction necessary to avoid circumlocution, the sentence *imputes the act* to the *thing beheld*, the qualifying word must express the quality of the thing spoken of, *adjectively*, instead of qualifying the act of the nominative understood, *adverbially*. What an adjective is to a noun, an adverb is to a verb ; an adjective expresses the quality of a thing, and an adverb the manner of an action. Consider what it is you wish to express, the *quality of a thing*, or the *manner of an action*, and use an adjective or adverb accordingly. But beware that you discriminate justly, for though you cannot say, “ The Queen looked *majestically* in her robes,” because here the act of *looking* is performed by the spectator, who looks *at* her ; you can and *must* say,



"The Queen looked *graciously* on the petitioner;" "The Queen looked *mercifully* on his prayer;" because here the *act* of *looking* is performed *by* the Queen. You cannot say, "These flowers smell sweetly," because it is *you* that smell, and not the flowers; but you can say, "These flowers perfume the air deliciously," because it is *they* which impart the fragrance, not you. You cannot say, "This dress looks badly," because it is you that look, not the dress; but you can say, "This dress *fits* badly," because it is the dress that performs the act of fitting, either well or ill. There are some peculiar idioms which it would be better to avoid altogether, if possible, but if you feel compelled to use them, take them as they are; you cannot prune and refine them by the rules of syntax, and to attempt to do so shows ignorance as well as affectation.

23. There is a mistake often committed in the use of the adverbs of place, hence, thence, whence. People are apt to say, "He will go *from thence* tomorrow, etc." The preposition "from" is included in these adverbs, therefore it becomes tautology in sense when prefixed to them.

24. "Equally as well," is a very common expression, and a very incorrect one; the adverb of comparison "as" has no right in the sentence. "Equally well," "equally high," "equally dear," should be the construction; and if a complement be necessary in the phrase, it should be preceded by the preposition "with," as "The wall was equally high with the former one;" "The goods at Smith's are equally dear with those sold at the

shop next door," etc., etc. "Equally the same," is tautology.

25. "Whether," sometimes an adverb, sometimes a conjunction, is a word that plainly indicates a choice of things (of course, I cannot be supposed to mean a *freedom* of choice), it is highly improper, therefore, to place it, as many do, at the head of each part of a sentence, as "I have not yet made up my mind whether I shall go to France, or *whether* I shall remain in America." The conjunction should not be repeated, as it is evident the alternative is expressed *only in the combination* of the *two* parts of the sentence, not in either of them taken separately; and the phrase should stand thus: "I have not yet made up my mind whether I shall go to France, *or* remain in America."

26. There is an awkwardness prevalent amongst all classes of society in such sentences as the following: "He quitted his horse, and got *on to* a stage coach;" "He jumped *on to* the floor;" "She laid it *on to* a dish;" "I threw it *on to* the fire." Why use two prepositions where one would be quite as explicit, and far more elegant? Nobody in the present day, would think of saying, "He came up to New York *for* to go to the Exhibition," because the preposition "for" would be an awkward superfluity; so is "to" in the examples given, in each of which there is an unwieldiness of construction which reminds one of the process of glueing, or fastening, one thing "on to" another. Expunge the redundant preposition, and be assured, gentle reader, the sentence will still be found "an elegant

sufficiency.” There are some situations, however, in which the two prepositions may with propriety be employed, though they are never indispensable, as “I accompanied Such-a-one to High Bridge, and then walked on to Harlem.” But here *two* motions are implied, the walking onward, and the reaching of a certain point. More might be said to illustrate the distinction, but we consider it will not be deemed necessary.

27. There seems to be a natural tendency to deal in a redundancy of prepositions: many people talk of “continuing *on*.” I should be glad to be informed in what other direction it would be possible to *continue*?

28. It is most illiterate to put the preposition *of* after the adverb *off*, as “The satin measured twelve yards before I cut this piece *off of* it;” “The fruit was gathered *off of* that tree.” Many of my readers will consider such a remark quite unnecessary in this volume; but many others, who ought to know better, must stand self-condemned on reading it.

29. There is a false taste extant for the preposition “on” instead of “*of*” in songs, poetry, and many other situations in which there is still less excuse for borrowing the poetic license; such as, “Wilt thou think *on* me, love?” “I will think *on* thee, love?” “Then think *on* the friend who once welcomed it too,” etc., etc., etc. But this is an error chiefly to be met with among poetasters, and melodramatic speakers.

30. Some people add a superfluous preposition at the end of a sentence—“More than you think *for*.”

This, however, is an awkwardness rarely committed by persons of decent education.

31. Never speak of a thing looking well or ill "*at*" candle-light; *by* candle-light is the proper construction. "*By* day or night, or any kind of light."

32. That "Prepositions govern the objective case" is a golden rule in grammar; and if it were only *well remembered*, it would effectually correct that mistake of substituting the nominative for the objective pronoun, which has been complained of in the preceding pages. In using a relative pronoun in the objective case, it is more elegant to put the preposition before than after it, thus, "To whom was the order given?" instead of "Whom was the order given to?" Indeed, if this practice was invariably adopted, it would obviate the possibility of confounding the nominative with the objective case, because no man would ever find himself able to utter such a sentence as, "To who was this proposal made?" though he might very unconsciously say, "Who was this proposal made to?" and the error would be equally flagrant in both instances.

33. There is a great inaccuracy connected with the use of the distinctive conjunctions *or* and *nor*, which seem to be either not clearly understood, or treated with undue contempt by persons who speak in the following manner: "Henry or John *are* to go there to-night;" "His son or his nephew *have* since put in *their* claim;" "Neither one *nor* the other *have* the least chance of success." The con-

junctions disjunctive “or” and “nor” separate the objects in sense, as the conjunction-copulative unites them; and as, by the use of the former, the things stand forth separately and singly to the comprehension, the verb or pronoun must be rendered in the singular number also; as, “Henry *or* John *is* to go there to-night;” “His son *or* his nephew *has* since put in *his* claim,” etc. If you look over the sentence, you will perceive that only *one* is to do the act, therefore only *one* can be the nominative to the verb.

34. Many people improperly substitute the disjunctive “but” for the comparative “than,” as, “The mind no sooner entertains any proposition, *but* it presently hastens to some hypothesis to bottom it on;”—Locke. “No other resource *but* this was allowed him;” “My behaviour,” says she, “has, I fear, been the death of a man who had no other fault *but* that of loving me too much.”—Spectator.

35. Sometimes a relative pronoun is used instead of a conjunction in such sentences as the following: “I don’t know *but what* I shall go to Philadelphia to-morrow;” instead of “I don’t know *but that*,” etc.

36. Sometimes the disjunctive “but” is substituted for the conjunction *that*, as “I have no doubt *but* he will be here to-night.” Sometimes for the conjunction “*if*,” as, “I shouldn’t wonder *but* that was the case.” And sometimes *two* conjunctions are used instead of one, as “*If that* I have offended him;” “*After that* he had seen the parties,” etc.



All this is very awkward indeed, and ought to be avoided, and might easily be so by a little attention.

If a man who is desirous of attaining propriety of speech, would sometimes take up his grammar *con amore*, and search into this or that dubious point which negligence and bad example have contributed to obscure for him, acquaint himself with the mechanism of certain rules, and unmake and remake a few sentences constructed on them, he would soon acquire sufficient information for his own guidance. It is not necessary that he should make an Herculean labour of it—should begin with the first page of Etymology, and go plodding through to the last of Prosody, a process which seems to be looked on as so inevitable by the mass, that they therefore eschew Grammars altogether;—but dip into syntax, my friend, take up the rules indiscriminately, if that be lighter labour for the mind, and if you had ever “done grammar-lessons” before, you will soon master the few remaining difficulties, will acquire a purity of style in your own writing and conversation, and add *your* mite towards refining the language of your fathers.

37. It is obsolete now to use the article *an* before words beginning with long *u*, or with *eu*, and it has become more elegant, in modern style, to say, “a University,” a “useful article,” “a European,” “a euphonious combination of sentences,” etc., etc., etc. It is also proper to say “such a one,” not “such an one.”

38. Some people pronounce the plural of handkerchief, scarf, wharf, dwarf, *handkerchieves*, *scarves*,

*wharves, dwarves.* This is an error, as these words, and perhaps a few others, are exceptions to the rule laid down, that nouns ending in *f* or *fe*, shall change these terminations into *ves* to form the plural.

39. There is an illiterate mode of pronouncing the adverb *too*, which is that of contracting it into the sound of the preposition *to*, thus:—"I think I paid *to much* for this gun;" "This line is *to long* by half." The adverb *too* should be pronounced like the numeral adjective *two*, and have the same full distinct sound in delivery, as "I think I paid *two much* for this gun;" "This line is *two long* by half."

40. One does not expect to hear such words as "necessi'ated," "preventative," etc., from people who profess to be educated, but one *does* hear them, nevertheless, and many others of the same genus, of which the following list is a specimen, not a collection.

"Febuary" and "Febbiwerry" instead of February.

"Seckaterry" instead of secretary.

"Gover'ment" "government.

"Eve'min" "evening.

"Sev'm" "seven.

"Holladiz" "holidays.

"Chapped" according to orthography, instead of *chopped* according to polite usage.

And we have even heard "continental" pronounced *continential*, though upon what authority we know not. Besides these, a multitude of others

might be quoted, which we consider too familiar to particularize, and "too numerous to mention."

41. There is an old jest on record of a person hearing another pronounce the word curiosity, "*curosimy*," and remarking to a by-stander, "That man murders the English language;" "Nay," replies the person addressed, "he only knocks an eye (i) out." And I am invariably reminded of this old jest whenever I hear such pronunciations as the following: "Lat'n" for latin, and "sat'n" for satin; of which a few examples will be given on a subsequent page, not with the wild hope of comprising in so short a space *all* the perversions of Prosody which are constantly taking place, but simply with the intention of reminding careless speakers of some general principles they seem to have forgotten, and of the vast accumulation of error they may engraft upon themselves by a lazy adherence to the custom of the crowd. Before, however, proceeding to the words in question, it may be satisfactory to our readers to recall to their memory the observations of Lindley Murray on this subject. He says, "There is scarcely anything which more distinguishes a person of a poor education from a person of a good one, than the pronunciation of the *unaccented vowels*. When vowels are *under the accent*, the best speakers, and the lowest of the people, with very few exceptions, pronounce them in the same manner; but the *unaccented vowels* in the mouths of the former, have a distinct, open, and specific sound; while the latter often totally sink them, or change them into some other sound." The

words that have chiefly struck me are the following, in which not only the *i* but many of the other vowels are submitted to the mutilating process, or, as I have heard it pronounced, *mutulating*,—

Amer'can instead of American.

Lat'n " Latin.

Sat'n " Satin.

Patt'n " Patten.

Curt'n " Curtain.

Cert'n " Certain.

Bridle " Bridal.

Idle " Idol.

Meddle " Medal.

Moddle " Model.

Mentle " Mental.

Mortle " Mortal.

Fatle " Fatal.

Gravle " Gravel.

Travle " Travel.

Sudd'n " Sudden.

Infidle " Infidel.

Scroop'-lous " Scru-pu-lous.

And a long train of et ceteras, of which the above examples do not furnish a tithe.

*Note.*—That to sound the *e* in *garden* and *often*, and the *i* in *evil* and *devil*, is a decided error: they should always be pronounced *gard'n* and *oft'n*; *ev'l* and *dev'l*.

42. It is affected, and contrary to authority, to deprive the *s* of its sharp hissing sound in the words *precise*, *desolate*, *design*, and their derivatives.

43. I would venture to ask, with all humility, why the word *chariot* should be made to rhyme with *carrot*? If this mispronunciation, were confined to the lower and middle classes I would, without hesitation, denounce it as a flagrant illiteracy; but having heard it occasionally from patrician lips, I naturally approach the subject with a degree of reverence, lest, to deform and vulgarize the language as much as possible, should be some mysterious aristocratic privilege, that we, in common life, are unacquainted with.

---

## N PUNCTUATION.

Punctuation treats of the points or marks inserted in written composition, for the purpose of showing more clearly the sense intended to be conveyed, and the pauses required in reading.

The principal points or marks employed in punctuation are—the comma [,], the semicolon [;], the colon[:], the period [.] , the note of interrogation [?], the note of exclamation[!], and the dash[—].

The comma requires a momentary pause: the semicolon, a pause somewhat longer than the comma; the colon, a pause somewhat longer than the semicolon; and the period, a full stop. The note of interrogation, or the note of exclamation, may take the place of any one of these, and accordingly requires a pause of the same length as the point for which it is substituted.

The duration of these pauses depends on the cha-



rafter of the composition ; the grave style requiring much longer intervals than the lively or impassioned.

The sense of a passage often requires a pause in reading, where usage does not allow the insertion of a point in writing ; as in the sentence, "Our schemes of thought in childhood | are lost in those of youth." On the other hand, points are sometimes inserted merely to indicate the syntactical construction, without requiring a suspension of the voice in reading ; as in the phrase, "No, Sir."

#### THE COMMA.

Rule 1.—When a relative and its antecedent are separated from each other by one or more words, a comma should generally be inserted before the relative ; as, "Think not *man* was made in vain, *who* has such an eternity reserved for him."—*Spectator*.

"There is a *pleasure* in poetic pains,  
*Which* only poets know."—*Cowper*.

*Exception* :—When, however, the intervening word is an adverb, the comma is more commonly omitted ; as, "It is *labor* only *which* gives a relish to pleasure."

Rule 2.—When two or more words come between the adjective and its noun, a comma is placed after the intervening words ; as, "To dispel these errors, and to give a *scope* to navigation, *equal* to the grandeur of his designs, Prince Henry called in the aid of science."—*Irving*.

Rule 3.—When the subject of a sentence consists

of several nominatives, or of a single nominative followed by an adjunct consisting of several words, a comma should be inserted before the following verb.

*Examples* :—"Many of the evils, which occasion our complaints of the world, *are* wholly imaginary."—"The effect of this universal diffusion of gay and splendid light, *was* to render the preponderating deep green more solemn."—*Reynolds*.

"The golden sun,  
The planets, all the infinite hosts of heaven,  
*Are shining* on the sad abodes of death."

**Rule 4.**—When a sentence or clause is used as the nominative to a preceding or following verb, it should be separated from the verb by a comma; as, "How dearly America remembered the parent island, *is told* by the English names of its towns."—*Sparks*.

**Rule 5.**—Two successive words, in the same construction, without a conjunction expressed, are generally separated by a comma; as, "An *aged, venerable* man."

"Has Nature, in her *calm, majestic* march,  
Faltered with age at last?"

An apparent exception to this rule often occurs in the case of two successive adjectives; as in the expression, "A venerable old man." But the two adjectives, in this example, are not in the same construction, since *old* qualifies *man*, while *venerable* qualifies the phrase, *old man*.

A comma may also be inserted before a conjunc-

tion expressed, if either of the words connected is followed by an adjunct consisting of several words; as, "Intemperance destroys the vigour of our bodies, and the strength of our minds."

Rule 6.—Three or more distinct, successive words in the same construction, with or without a conjunction expressed, should be separated by commas; as,

"Beside the bed where parting life was laid,  
And sorrow, guilt, and pain, by turns dismayed,  
The reverend champion stood."—*Goldsmith*

"An elegant sufficiency, content,  
Retirement, rural quiet, friendship, books,  
Ease and alternate labor, useful life,  
Progressive virtue, and approving Heaven."

*Thomson.*

"How poor, how rich, how abject, how august.  
How complicate, how wonderful, is man!"

*Young.*

The same apparent exception occurs in this rule as in the last. In the expression, "A light bluish green tint," *bluish* modifies *green*, and *light* modifies the phrase *bluish green*; while the three words, *light bluish green*, taken together, qualify *tint*.

Rule 7.—Successive pairs of words should be separated from each other by commas; as, "The authority of *Plato* and *Aristotle*, of *Zeno* and *Epicurus*, still reigned in the schools."

Rule 8.—When the different members of a compound sentence contain distinct propositions, they are generally separated from each other by commas.

*Examples*:—"They shrunk from no dangers,

and they feared no hardships." "And thus their physical science became magic, their astronomy became astrology, the study of the composition of bodies became alchemy, mathematics became the contemplation of the spiritual relations of number and figure, and philosophy became theosophy."—*Whewell*.

Rule 9.—When the different members of a sentence express a mutual comparison, contrast or opposition, they should generally be separated from each other by commas.

*Examples* :—"The more I reflected upon it, the more important it appeared."—*Goldsmith*.  
 "The Quaker revered principles, not men; truth, not power." "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee."—*Psalms* xlii. 1.

Rule 10.—To prevent ambiguity in cases of Ellipsis, a comma is sometimes inserted in the place of the word or phrase omitted.

*Example* :—As a companion he was severe and satirical; as a friend, captious and dangerous; in his domestic sphere, harsh, jealous, and irascible."

Rule 11.—When two or more successive clauses and with words sustaining a common relation to some words in a following clause, a comma should generally be inserted after each.

*Examples* :—"The truest mode of enlarging our benevolence, is, not to quicken our sensibility towards great masses, or wide-spread evils, but to

*approach, comprehend, sympathize with, and act upon a continually increasing number of individuals.*”—*Channing*. “Such compulsion is not merely incompatible *with*, but impossible *in a free* or elective government.”

When, however, the word in the following clause is not accompanied by several words, the comma before it is often omitted; as, “We *may*, and often *do employ* these means.”

Rule 12.—When several words intervene between the verb of a principal clause and the commencement of a subordinate clause, the clauses should be separated from each other by a comma; as, “Had we stopped here, it might have done well enough.” —“He was nineteen years of age, when he bade adieu to his native shores.”

Rule 13.—When the connexion of a sentence is interrupted by one or more words, not closely related in construction to what precedes, a comma should generally be inserted both before and after the word or words introduced; as,

“He, like the world, his ready visit pays,  
Where fortune smiles.”—*Young*.

Rule 14.—The independent case, and the infinitive absolute, with their adjuncts should be separated from the rest of the sentence by commas.

*Examples*:—“To foster industry, to promote union, to cherish religious peace,—these were his honest purposes.”—“The playwriters, where are they? and the poets, are their fires extinguished?” —*H. More*.



“Wept o’er his wounds, or, tales of sorrow done,  
Shouldered his crutch and showed how fields were  
won.”—*Goldsmith*.

“Rejoice, you men of Angiers, ring your bells.”  
*Shakspeare*.

Rule 15.—When either of two words in apposition is accompanied by an adjunct, the latter of them, with the words depending upon it, should be set off from the rest of the sentence by commas; as, “The following is a dialogue between Socrates, the great Athenian philosopher, and one Glaucon, a private individual.”

Rule 16.—When a word or phrase is repeated for the sake of emphasis, a comma should be inserted both before and after it; as, “here, and here only, lies the peculiar character of the revolution.”

“Where are the flowers, the fair young flowers,  
that lately sprang and stood,  
In brighter light and softer airs, a beauteous  
sisterhood?”

*Note*.—When the word or words to be set off according to the three preceding rules stand at the beginning or end of a sentence, one of the commas is, of course, necessary.

#### THE SEMICOLON.

Rule 1.—When to a sentence complete in construction, a clause is added containing a reason, an explanation, an inference, or a contrast, it should

generally be preceded by a semicolon; as, "The past seems to promise it; but the fulfilment depends on the future."—"To the latter it is a double advantage; for it diminishes their pain here, and rewards them with heavenly bliss hereafter."—*Goldsmith*.

Rule 2.—When several successive clauses have a common connexion with a preceding or following clause, a semicolon is generally inserted after each.

*Examples* :—"Children as they gamboled on the beach; reapers, as they gathered the harvest; mowers, as they rested from using the scythe; mothers, as they busied themselves about the household;—were victims to an enemy, who disappeared the moment a blow was struck, and who was ever present, where a garrison or a family ceased its vigilance."—"Reason as we may, it is impossible not to read, in such a fate, much, that we know not how to interpret; much of provocation to cruel deeds and deep resentment; much of apology for wrong and perfidy; much of doubt and misgiving as to the past; much of painful recollections; much of dark foreboding."

Rule 3.—When several particulars are enumerated in a sentence, some of which are expressed in several words, they are often separated from each other by semicolons; as, "The Aragonese cortes was composed of four branches or arms; the *ricos hombres*, or great barons; the lesser nobles, com-

prehending the knights; the clergy; and the commons.”—*Robertson*.

Rule 4.—Two or more successive short sentences having no common dependence, are often separated by semicolons instead of periods.

*Example* :—“ As we have already noticed, its bruised leaves afforded a paste, from which paper was manufactured ; its juice was formed into an intoxicating beverage, *pulque*, of which the natives, to this day, are excessively fond ; its leaves supplied an impenetrable thatch for the more humble dwellings ; thread, of which coarse stuffs were made, and strong cords, were drawn from its tough and twisted fibres ; pins and needles were made of the thorns at the extremity of its leaves ; and the root, when properly cooked, was converted into a palatable and nutritious food.”—*Prescott*.

#### THE COLON.

The colon is much less used now than formerly : its place being supplied by the period, the semicolon, or the dash. At present, our best writers seldom use this point, except in the following cases :—

Rule 1.—When a quotation or enumeration is introduced by such expressions as *in these words*, *the following*, *as follows*, either expressed or implied, the quotation or enumeration may be preceded by a colon.

*Examples* :—“ The following items of the tribute furnished by different cities, will give a more

precise idea of its nature : 20 chests of tea ; 40 pieces," &c.—“ Mr. Tierney rose and said :—‘ Mr. Speaker, the honour,’ ” &c.

“ All were attentive to the godlike man,  
When from his lofty couch he thus began :  
‘ Great Queen,’ ” &c.—*Dryden*.

In the case of enumeration, a semicolon is frequently employed instead of a colon.

Rule 2.—It is customary in title pages to insert a colon between the name of the place, at which the book is published, and the name of the publisher ; as, “ London : John Murray, Albemarle Street.”—“ Edinburgh : Oliver and Boyd, Tweeddale Court.”

*Note*.—Every verse of the *Psalms* and *Litany* in the book of Common Prayer is divided by a colon ; as, “ My tongue is the pen : of a ready writer.”—This point is inserted for the use of choirs, where such parts of the service are chanted ; and is merely used to divide the verse for that purpose. No attention should be paid to this *point* in *reading* the *Psalms*, unless when it happens to coincide [which it sometimes does] with the rules of punctuation.

#### THE PERIOD.

The period is placed at the end of a complete sentence.

A period is sometimes inserted between two complete sentences, which are connected by a conjunction : as, “ By degrees the confidence of the natives was exhausted ; they had welcomed powerful guests,

who had promised to become their benefactors, and who now robbed their humble granaries. But the worst evil in the new settlement was the character of the emigrants.

The period should be used after all abbreviations, as, "Bucks.," "M.D.," "Aug.," "Esq.," "Mrs.," "Mr." Such expressions as 4th, 10th, 4's, 9's, 4to, 8vo, 12mo, do not require the period after them, since they are not strictly abbreviations, the figures supplying the place of the first letters of the words.

#### THE DASH.

The dash is used, where a sentence is left unfinished; where there is a sudden turn or an abrupt transition; and where a significant pause is required.

*Examples*:—"Let the government do this—the people will do the rest."—*Macaulay*.

"Ah, that maternal smile! it answers—Yes!"

*Cowper.*

"He suffer'd,—but his pangs are o'er;  
Enjoyed,—but his delights are fled;  
Had friends,—his friends are now no more;  
And foes,—his foes are dead."—*Montgomery*.

Modern writers often employ dashes in place of the parenthesis.

#### THE NOTE OF INTERROGATION.

The note of interrogation is placed at the end of a sentence, in which a direct question is asked; as, "What is to be done?"



## THE NOTE OF EXCLAMATION.

The note of exclamation is used after expressions of sudden emotion or passion, and after solemn invocations and addresses; as,

“Liberty! Freedom! Tyranny is dead:

Run hence, proclaim, cry it about the streets!”

*Shakspeare.*

“Night, sable goddess! from her ebon throne,

In rayless majesty now stretches forth

Her leaden sceptre o’er a slumbering world.

Silence how dead! and darkness how profound!”

*Young.*

“Hail, holy light! offspring of heaven first born!”

*Milton.*

When the interjection *Oh* is used, the point is generally placed immediately after it; but when *O* is employed, the point is placed after one or more intervening words, as,

“Oh! my offence is rank, it smells to heaven.”

*Shakspeare.*

“But thou, O Hope! with eyes so fair,—

What was thy delighted measure?”—*Collins.*

*The following characters are also employed in Composition:*

The *parenthesis* ( ) generally includes a word, phrase, or remark, which is merely incidental or explanatory, and which might be omitted without injury to the grammatical construction; as,

“The tuneful Nine (so sacred legends tell)

First waked their heavenly lyre these scenes to tell.”—*Campbell.*

“Know then this truth, (enough for man to know,) Virtue alone is happiness below.”—*Pope*.

The parenthesis is now employed less frequently than formerly; commas or dashes being used to supply its place; as, “The colonists—such is human nature—desired to burn the town in which they had been so wretched.”—*Robertson*.

The *apostrophe* (') is used to denote the omission of one or more letters; as, *o'er, tho'*. It is likewise the sign of the possessive case, being used instead of a letter, which was formerly inserted in its place; as, *man's* for *manes*, or, *manis*.

*Marks of quotation* (“ ”) are used to indicate that the exact words of another are introduced; as, “In my first parliament,” said James, “I was a novice.”

When a quotation is introduced within a quotation, it is usually distinguished by single inverted commas; as, “I was not only a ship-boy on the ‘high and giddy mast,’ but also in the cabin, where every menial office fell to my lot.” If both quotations commence or terminate together, this commencement or termination is indicated by the use of three commas; as, “In the course of this polite attention, he pointed in a certain direction, and exclaimed, ‘That is Mr. Bradley, of York, a man, whose benevolence is proverbial.’”

When a point is inserted immediately after a quotation, it should be placed within the quotation marks.

A *mark of accent* (') is sometimes placed over a syllable to denote that it requires particular stress in pronunciation.

A *diaeresis* ( ·· ) is sometimes placed over the latter of two successive vowels to show that they do not form a diphthong; as, *coöperate*, *aërial*.

The *cedilla* ( ¸ ) is a mark, which is sometimes placed under the letter *c* to show that it has the sound of *s*; as in “*façade*.”

The *paragraph* (¶) is used in the Old and New Testaments to denote the beginning of a new subject. In other books, paragraphs are distinguished by commencing a new line further from the margin than the beginning of the other lines. This is called *indenting*.

---

#### FIGURES OF SPEECH.

A figure of speech is a departure from the ordinary *form* of words, from their regular *construction*, or from their literal *signification*.

Departures from the usual *form* of words are called *figures of Etymology*.

Departures from the regular *construction* of words are called *figures of Syntax*.

Departures from the literal *signification* of words are called *figures of Rhetoric*.

#### *Figures of Etymology.*

The figures of Etymology are *Aphaëresis*, *Sýncope*, *Apócope*, *Prósthesis*, *Paragóge*, *Synaëresis*, *Diaëresis*, and *Tmésis*.

1. *Aphaeresis* is the taking of a letter or syllable from the beginning of a word, as, *'neath* for *beneath*; *'gainst* for *against*.

“But his courage ’gan fail,  
For no arts could avail.”

2. *Syncope* is the elision of one or more letters from the middle of a word; as, *ling’ring* for *lingering*; *lov’d* for *loved*.

3. *Apocope* is the elision of one or more letters from the end of a word; as, *thro’* for *through*; *th’* for *the*.

4. *Prosthesis* is the addition of one or more letters to the beginning of a word; as, *beloved* for *loved*; *enchain* for *chain*; *adown* for *down*.

5. *Paragoge* is the addition of one or more letters to the end of a word; as, *awaken* for *awake*; *bounden* for *bound*; *deary* for *dear*.

6. *Synaeresis* is the contraction of two syllables into one; as, *sēst* for *sē-ēst*; *alienate* for *a-li-ēn-ate*.

N.B. *Alienate* in three syllables, as if written *ale-yen-ate*.

7. *Diaeresis* is the separation of two vowels standing together, so as to connect them with different syllables; as, *coöperate*, *aërial*.

7. *Tmesis* is the separation of a compound word into two parts, by introducing another word between them; as, “Thy thoughts, which are *to* us *ward*” for “Thy thoughts, which are *toward* us;” —“*How* high *soever*” for “*Howsoever* high.”

### *Figures of Syntax.*

The principal figures of Syntax are *Ellipsis*, *Pléonasm*, *Enállage*, and *Hypérbaton*.

1. *Ellipsis* is the omission of one or more words, which are necessary to complete the grammatical

construction. The following examples will serve to illustrate this figure :—

1. *Nouns* ; as, “ St. Peter’s ” [church] ;—“ The twelve ” [apostles].

2. *Adjectives* ; as, “ Every day and [every] hour ; ”—“ A gentleman and [a] lady.”

3. *Pronouns* ; as, “ I am monarch of all [which] I survey ; ”—“ He left in the morning, and [he] returned the same day.”

4. *Verbs* ; as, “ To whom the angel ” [spoke] ; —[Let] “ No man eat fruit of thee.”

5. *Adverbs* ; as, “ He spoke [wisely] and acted wisely.”

6. *Prepositions* ; as, “ He was banished [from] England ; ”—“ He lived like [to] a prince.”

7. *Conjunctions* ; as, “ I came, [and] I saw, [and] I conquered.

8. *Phrases and entire clauses* ; as, “ I love you for nothing more than [I love you] for the just esteem you have for all the sons of Adam.”—*Swift*.

2. *Pleonasm* is the use of more words to express ideas than are necessary ; as, “ I know thee *who thou art*.”—*N. Test*. “ What we have seen *with our eyes*, and heard *with our ears*.”

The repetition of a conjunction is termed *Poly-syndeton* ; as, “ We have ships *and* men *and* money *and* stores.”

3. *Enallage* is the use of one part of speech for another ;\* as,

\* Deviations of this kind are, in general, to be considered *solecisms* ; otherwise, the rules of grammar would be of no



"*Slow* rises merit, when by poverty depressed."

"Sure some disaster has *befell*."—*Gay*.

4. *Hyperbaton* is the transposition of words; as, "All price beyond" for "Beyond all price." "He wanders earth around" for "He wanders around the earth."

### *Figures of Rhetoric.*

The principal figures of Rhetoric are *Simile*, *Métaphor*, *Allegory*, *Antíthesis*, *Hypérbole*, *Irony*, *Metónymy*, *Synécdoche*, *Personification*, *Apóstrophe*, *Interrogátion*, *Exclamátion*, *Vision*, and *Clímax*.

1. A *Simile* is a direct and formal comparison; as, "He shall be *like* a tree planted by the rivers of water."

"*As*, down in the sunless retreats of the ocean,  
Sweet flowrets are springing no mortal can see;  
*So*, deep in my bosom, the prayer of devotion,  
Unheard by the world, rises silent to thee."

*Moore.*

2. A *Metaphor* is an implied comparison; as,

"Wild fancies in his moody brain  
*Gambol'd unbridled and unbound*."—*Hogg*.

3. An *Allegory* is a continued metaphor. In the following beautiful example, found in the 80th Psalm, the people of Israel are represented under the symbol of a vine:—

use or authority. There are, however, some changes of this kind, which the grammarian must not condemn, though they do not agree with the ordinary principles of construction.

“Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt: thou hast cast out the heathen, and planted it. Thou preparedst room before it, and didst cause it to take deep root, and it filled the land. The hills were covered with the shadow of it, and the boughs thereof were like the goodly cedars. She sent out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river. Why hast thou then broken down her hedges, so that all they, which pass by the way, do pluck her? The boar out of the wood doth waste it, and the wild beast of the field doth devour it.”

4. An *Antithesis* is an expression denoting opposition or contrast; as,

“Contrasted faults through all their manners reign;  
Though *poor, luxurious*; though *submissive, vain*;  
Though *grave, yet trifling*; *zealous, yet untrue*;  
And e’en in *penance, planning sins* anew.”

*Goldsmith.*

“The wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion.”

5. An *Hyperbole* is an exaggeration in the use of language, representing objects as greater or less, better or worse, than they really are. Thus, David speaking of Saul and Jonathan, says, “They were swifter than eagles; they were stronger than lions.”

“The sky *shrunk upward with unusual dread*,  
And trembling Tiber *div’d beneath his bed*.”

*Dryden.*

6. *Irony* is a mode of speech expressing a sense contrary to that, which the speaker or writer intends

to convey. The Prophet Elijah employed this figure, when he said to the priests of Baal, "Cry aloud, for he is a God; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked."

7. *Metonymy* is a figure by which one thing is put for another; as, "I have been reading *Milton*;" that is, his *poems* or *works*.—"Gray hairs [*old age*] should be respected."—"The sceptre [*kingly power*] shall not depart from Judah."

8. *Synecdoche* is a figure, by which the whole is put for a part, or a part for the whole; as, "*Man* returneth to dust;" that is, his *body*.—"This roof [*house*] shall be his protection."

9. *Personification*, or *Prosopopeia*, is a figure, by which we attribute life and action to inanimate objects; or ascribe to irrational animals and objects without life the actions and qualities of rational beings; as,

"See, *Winter* comes to rule the varied year,  
Sullen and sad, with all his rising train."

*Thomson.*

"*Vice* is a monster of such frightful mien,  
That, to be hated, needs but to be seen:  
But—seen too oft, familiar with her face,  
We first endure—then pity—then embrace."

*Pope.*

10. *Apostrophe* is a figure, by which a speaker or writer turns from the party, to which his discourse is mainly directed, and addresses himself to some person or thing, present or absent; as, "Death is

swallowed up in victory. *O Death! where is thy sting? O Grave! where is thy victory?*—1 Cor. xv. 54, 55.

“O gentle sleep,  
Nature’s soft nurse, how have I frighted thee,  
That thou no more wilt weigh my eyelids down,  
And steep my senses in forgetfulness?”

In modern usage, the term *Apostrophe* is applied to any address made to an inanimate object, an irrational animal, or an absent person; as,

“Hail, holy Light, offspring of Heaven, first-born!”  
*Milton.*

“Sail on, thou lone, imperial bird,  
Of quenchless eye, and tireless wing.”  
*Mellen.*

“Alas! my noble boy! that thou shouldst die!  
Thou, who wert made so beautifully fair!  
That death should settle in thy glorious eye,  
And leave his stillness in this clustering hair!  
How could he mark thee for the silent tomb!  
My proud boy, Absalom!”—*Willis.*

11. *Interrogation* is a figure, by which a question is asked for the purpose of expressing an assertion more strongly; as, “Do we mean to submit to this measure? Do we mean to submit and consent that we ourselves, our country and its rights, shall be trampled on? I know we do not mean to submit. We never will submit.”—*Webster.*

12. *Exclamation* is a figure employed to express some strong emotion; as,

“O wretched state ! O bosom, black as death !”

*Shakspeare.*

“Ah ! how unjust to nature and himself,  
Is thoughtless, thankless, inconsistent man !”

*Young.*

“O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom  
and the knowledge of GOD ! How unsearchable  
are his judgments, and his ways past finding out !”

13. *Vision*, or *Imagery*, is a figure, by which past  
or future events are represented as passing before  
our eyes ; as,

“I see the dagger-crest of Mar !

I see the Moray’s silver star

Wave o’er the cloud of Saxon war,

That up the lake comes winding far !”—*Scott.*

14. *Climax* is a figure, in which the ideas rise or  
sink in regular gradation ; as, “ Giving all diligence,  
add to your faith, virtue ; and to virtue, knowledge ;  
and to knowledge, temperance ; and to temperance,  
patience ; and to patience, godliness ; and to godli-  
ness, brotherly kindness ; and to brotherly kindness,  
charity.”—2 *Pet.* i. 5—7. “ What a piece of work  
is man ! how noble in reason ! how infinite in facul-  
ties ! in form and moving, how express and admira-  
ble ! in action, how like an angel ! in apprehension,  
how like a god !”—*Shakspeare.* “ What is every  
year of a wise man’s life but a criticism on the past !  
Those, whose life is the shortest, live long enough  
to laugh at one half of it : the boy despises the in-  
fant, the man the boy, the sage both, and the  
Christian all.”



EXPLANATION OF LATIN WORDS AND PHRASES  
OF FREQUENT OCCURRENCE.

Ab initio : *from the beginning.*

Ad captandum vulgus : *to catch the rabble.*

Ad infinitum : *to infinity, without end.*

Ad libitum : *at pleasure.*

Ad referendum : *for further consideration.*

Ad valorem : *in proportion to the value.*

Æquo animo : *with an unruffled mind.*

A fortiori : *with stronger reason.*

Alias : *otherwise ; as, " Jones alias Brown."*

Alibi : *elsewhere.*

Alma mater : *a benign mother ; applied generally to the University.*

A mensa et thoro : *divorced from bed and board.*

Amor patriæ : *the love of our country.*

Anglice : *In English,*

Anno Domini : [A.D.] *in the year of our Lord.*

Anno Mundi ; [A.M.] *in the year of the world.*

Annus Mirabilis : *the year of wonders.*—A Poem of Dryden's, so called in commemoration of the great fire of London.

A posteriori : *from the effect to the cause.*

A priori : *from the cause to the effect.*

Arcanum : *a secret.*

Arcana imperii : *state secrets.*

Argumentum ad hominem : *an appeal to the professed principles or practices of the adversary.*

Argumentum ad iudicium : *an appeal to the common sense of mankind.*

Argumentum ad fidem : *an appeal to our faith.*

Argumentum ad populum : *an appeal to the people.*

Argumentum ad passiones : *an appeal to the passions.*

Audi alteram partem : *hear the other party.*

Bona fide : *in good faith : in reality.*

Contra : *against.*

Cacoëthes scribendi, loquendi : *an itch for writing, for talking.*

Capias : *a writ to authorize the seizure of the defendant's person.*

Caput mortuum : *the worthless remains.*

Certiorari : *to be made more certain.*

Ceteris paribus : *other circumstances being equal.*

Commune bonum : *a common good.*

Compos mentis : *in one's senses : a man of sane mind.*

Contra bonos mores : *against good morals or manners.*

Cui bono ? Cui malo ? *to what good—to what evil, will it tend ?*

Cum privilegio : *with privilege, with peculiar privilege.*

Currente Calamo : *with a running pen : with great rapidity.*

Custos rotulorum : *the keeper of the rolls and records.*

Data : *things given or granted.*

De facto : *in fact, in reality.*

De jure : *in right, in law.*

Dei gratia : *by the grace or favor of GOD.*

De mortuis nil nisi bonum : *let nothing be said of the dead but what is favorable.*

Deo favente—juvante—volente: *with GOD's favor—help—will.*

Desideratum: *a thing desired.*

Desunt cetera: *the remainder is wanting.*

Dies faustus: *a lucky day*: dies infaustus, *an unlucky day.*

Domine, dirige nos: *O Lord, direct us.*

Dramatis personæ: *the characters of the drama, or, the characters represented.*

Durante vita: *during life.*

Durante placito: *during pleasure.*

Ecce homo: *behold the man.*

Ergo: *therefore.*

Esto perpetua: *let it be perpetual.*

Errata: *errors—erratum, an error.*

Et cetera: *and the rest, and so on.*

Excerpta: *extracts.*

Exempli gratia: *by way of example*: [contracted, *E. g.*, and *Ex. gr.*].

Ex officio: *by virtue of his office.*

Ex parte: *on one side*; an “*ex parte*” statement, that is, *a one-sided statement.*

Ex tempore, or, as an English word, extempore: *without premeditation, without previous study.*

Fac simile, or, as an English word, facsimile; *an engraved or lithographed resemblance of handwriting.*

Fas est et ab hoste doceri: *it is allowable to derive instruction even from an enemy.*

Felo de se; *a suicide*: in law applied to one, who is supposed to have killed himself when in a sound state of mind.

Fiat: *let it be done.*

Fiat justitia, ruat coelum: *let justice be done, though the heavens should fall.*

Filius nullius: *an illegitimate son, the son of nobody.*

Flagrante bello: *during hostilities.*

Gratis: *for nothing, gratuitously.*

Hinc illae lachrymae: *hence proceed those tears.*

Hora fugit: *time flies, or the hour flies.*

Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto: *I am a man, and deem nothing, that relates to mankind, foreign to my feelings.*

Hortus siccus: *a collection of the leaves of plants in a dried state.*

Humanum est errare: *to err is human.*

Ibidem: *in the same place*: [contracted, *ibid.*].

Idem: *the same.*

Id est: *that is*: [contracted, *i. e.*]

Id genus omne: *all persons of that description.*

Ignis fatuus: *the meteor, or electrical phenomenon called "Will-o'-the-wisp."*

Ignoramus: *a conceited ignorant pretender to knowledge or learning.*

In loco; *in this place.*

Imprimatur: *let it be printed.*

Imprimis: *in the first place.*

Impromptu: *without study.*

In commendam: *in trust.*

In terrorem: *as a warning.*

In propria persona: *in person.*

In statu quo: *in the former state: just as it was.*

In forma pauperis: *as a poor man.*

In foro conscientiae: *before the tribunal of conscience.*

In re : *in the matter of.*

In transitu : *in passing.*

Index expurgatorius : *a purifying index.*

Iniquissimam pacem justissimo bello antefero :  
*prefer the most disadvantageous peace to the  
 justest war.* [The favorite maxim of FOX.]

Innuendo : *an oblique hint or insinuation.*

Inter nos : *between ourselves.*

Invita Minerva : *without the aid of genius.*

Ipse dixit : *on his sole assertion ; he himself said it.*

Ipso facto : *by the act itself.*

Ipso jure : *by the law itself.*

Item : *also.*

Judex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur : *the judge  
 is condemned [or blamed] when a guilty man is  
 acquitted, or suffered to escape.*

Jure divino : *by divine law.*

Jure humano : *by human law.*

Jus civile : *by the civil law.*

Jus gentium : *the law of nations.*

Labor omnia vincit : *labour surmounts every difficulty.*

Laudari a viro laudato : *to be praised by a man who  
 is himself the object of praise.*

Lapsus linguae : *a slip of the tongue.*

Laudator temporis acti : *a praiser of past times.*

Lex non scripta : *the common law.*

Lex scripta : *the statute law.*

Lex terrae : *the law of the land.*

Litera scripta manet : *what you have written remains  
 in black and white.*

Locum tenens : *a deputy, a substitute.*

Locus sigilli [L.S.] : *the place of the seal.*



Licentia vatum : *a poetical license.*

Magna Charta : *The Great Charter, THE BASIS OF OUR LAWS AND LIBERTIES.*

Magni nominis umbra : *the shadow of a great name.*

Mandamus : *a royal order or command.*

Medio tutissimus ibis : *you will act wisely by steering a middle course.*

Memento mori : *remember that you are to die.*

Memorabilia : *matters deserving of record or remembrance.*

Mens sibi conscia recti : *a mind conscious to itself of rectitude.*

Meum et tuum : *mine and thine.*

Minutiae : *trifles, minute parts.*

Mirabile dictu : *wonderful to tell.*

Mittimus : *a writ to commit an offender to prison.*

Multum in parvo : *much in little—a great deal in a few words.*

Mutatis mutandis : *after making the necessary changes.*

Necessitas non habet leges : *necessity has no law.*

Nem. con. Abbreviation for *nemine contradicente* :

Nem. dis. Abbreviation for *nemine dissentiente* :

WITHOUT OPPOSITION. The former is used in the House of Commons; the latter in the House of Peers, to express concurrence.

Nemo me impune lacesset : *no one shall injure me with impunity.*

Nemo mortalium omnibus horis sapit : *no one is wise at all times.*

Nemo repente fuit turpissimus : *no one ever became notoriously vicious all at once.*

Ne plus ultra : *nothing beyond—the utmost point.*

Ne quid nimis : *too much of one thing is good for nothing.*

Ne sutor ultra crepidam ; *let not the shoemaker go beyond his last, or, meddle with what he does not understand.*

Nil conscire sibi, nulla pallescere culpa : *to be conscious of no crime, and to turn pale at no accusation.*

Nisi Dominus frustra : *unless the Lord be with us, all our efforts will be in vain.*

Nisi prius : *unless before* : a writ, by which the sheriff is to bring a jury to Westminster Hall on a certain day, “*unless before*” that day the Lords Justices go into his county to hold assizes.

Nolle prosequi : *to be unwilling to proceed.*—This is used when a plaintiff, having commenced an action, declines to proceed therein.

Non assumsit : *He did not assume.*—A plea in personal actions, when the defendant denies that any promise was made.

Non constat : *it does not appear.*

Non compos mentis : *not in one’s senses, not of a sound mind.*

Non obstante : *notwithstanding* ; a dispensing power in patents.

Non omnia possumus omnes : *we cannot all of us do everything.*

Non sequitur : *it does not follow as a matter of course.*

Nolens volens : *willing or unwilling.*

Noscitur ex sociis : *he is known by his companions.*

Nota bene : [N. B.] *mark well, take particular notice.*

Nunquam non paratus : *always ready.*

Obiter dictum : *a thing said by the way, or, in passing.*

Onus probandi : *the weight of proof, the burden of proving.*

Opprobrium medicorum : *the reproach of the faculty.*

Omnes : *all.*

O ! si sic omnia : *Oh ! that he had always done, or spoken thus.*

O tempora, O mores ! *O the time and the manners !*

Otium cum dignitate : *ease with dignity.*

Otium sine dignitate : *ease without dignity.*

Par nobile fratrum : [said ironically] *a noble pair of brothers.*

Particeps criminis : *an accomplice.*

Passim : *everywhere.*

Peccavi : *I have sinned.*

Pendente lite : *while the suit, or contest, is pending.*

Per fas et nefas ; *through right and wrong.*

Per saltum : *by a leap.*

Per se : *by itself.*

Poëta nascitur, non fit : *Nature, and not study, must form a poet.*

Posse comitatus : *the power of the county.*

Postulata : *things required.*

Praemonitus, praemunitus : *forewarned, fore-armed.*

Praemunire : *a writ issued against individuals, who hold illegal communication with the see of Rome.*

Prima facie : *on the first view, or appearance ; at first sight*

Primum mobile : *the main spring: the first impulse.*

Principiis obsta : *oppose the first appearance of evil.*

Pro aris et focis : *for our altars and firesides.*

Pro bono publico : *for the public good.*

Pro and con : *for and against.*

Pro hac vice : *for this turn.*

Pro loco et tempore : *for the place and time.*

Pro re nata : *for a special business: as occasion serves.*

Pro salute animae : *for the health of the soul.*

Pro rege, lege, et grege : *for the king, the constitution, and the people.*

Pro tempore : *for the time.*

Punica fides : *Carthaginian faith—treachery.*

Quantum : *how much.*

Quantum mutatus ab illo ! *How changed from what he once was !*

Quid nunc ? *what now ? applied to a newshunter.*

Quid pro quo : *tit for tat.*

Quoad hoc : *to this extent.*

Quo animo : *with what purpose, mind, or intention ?*

Quo jure : *by what right.*

Quoad : *as far as.*

Quod erat demonstrandum : *which was meant to be shown or demonstrated.*

Quondam : *formerly.*

Quorum : *of whom ; one of the quorum. This description of a justice of the peace is taken from the words of his "dedimus."*

Quo warranto ? *by what warrant ? A writ lying against the person, who has usurped any franchise or liberty against the king.*

Rara avis : *a rare bird, a prodigy.*

Re infecta : *without attaining his end.*

Requiescat in pace : *may he rest in peace!*

Res angusta domi : *straitened circumstances in family matters, in the domestic economy.*

Respice finem : *look to the end.*

Respublica : *the commonwealth.*

Resurgam : *I shall rise again.*

Rex : *a king.*

Regina : *a queen.*

Senatus consultum : *a decree of the senate.*

Seriatim : *in order.*

Sic itur ad astra : *such is the way to immortality.*

Sic passim : *so everywhere.*

Sic transit gloria mundi : *thus passes away the glory of the world.*

Sine die : *without specifying any particular day, to an indefinite time.*

Sine qua non : *an indispensable condition.*

Stat magni nominis umbra : *he stands under the shadow of a mighty name, or, he stands shaded by a mighty name.*

Sua cuique voluptas : *every one has his own pleasures.*

Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re : *gentle in [the] manner, but vigorous in [the] deed, or vigorous in action.*

Sub poena : *under a penalty.*

Sub silentio : *in silence.*

Sui generis : *of its own kind.*

Summum bonum : *the chief good.*

Summum jus summa injuria : *extreme law is extreme injustice.*



Supersedeas : a writ to stay proceedings.

Suppressio veri : *a suppression of the truth.*

Supra : *above.*

Suum cuique : *let every man have his own.*

Taedium vitae : *weariness of life.*

Tempora mutantur : *the times are changed.*

Toties quoties : *as often as.*

Toto coelo : *by the whole heavens—as opposite as the poles.*

Tria juncta in uno : *three joined in one.*

Ubi supra : *where above-mentioned.*

Una voce : *with one voice, unanimously.*

Ultimus : *the last* [contracted ult.].

Utile dulci : *the useful with the agreeable.*

Uti possidetis : *as you possess, or, as you now are.*

Vade mecum : *go with me—a constant companion*  
[usually applied to a publication intended for  
the pocket.]

Verbatim : *word for word.*

Versus : *against.*

Veni, vidi, vici : *I came, I saw, I conquered.*  
[Caesar's despatch to the Roman Senate.]

Venire facias : *the writ for summoning a jury.*

Venienti occurrere morbo : *meet the approaching disease.*

Vale : *farewell.*

Via : *by the way of.*

Vice : *in the room of.*

Vice versa : *the terms being exchanged.*

Vide : *see* : [contracted into v.].

Vide ut supra : *see as above—see the preceding statement.*

Vi et armis: *by main force.*

Vincit amor patriae: *the love of our country is the predominant feeling.*

Vis inertiae: *a property of matter.*

Vis poëtica: *poetic genius.*

Viva voce: *orally, by word of mouth: a viva voce examination, that is, an oral examination.*

Vivat Regina: *long live the Queen!*

Vivida vis animi: *the lively vigor of genius.*

Viz.: [videlicet]—namely.

Vox et praeterea nihil: *a voice and nothing more.*

Vox populi, vox Dei: *the voice of the people is the voice of GOD.*

Vulgo: *commonly.*

Vultus est index animi: *the countenance is the index of the mind.*

EXPLANATION OF FRENCH WORDS  
AND PHRASES OF FREQUENT OCCURRENCE.

Aide-de-camp : *an assistant to a general.*

A la bonne heure : *well and good, very well.—*

Arriver à la bonne heure : *to come just in time,  
at the right moment.*

Affaire de coeur : *a love affair.*

A la mode : *according to the fashion, in fashion.*

A propos : *seasonably, opportunely, to the purpose.*

Au fond : *to the bottom, or, main point, after all.*

A fond : *thoroughly.*

Bagatelle : *a trifle.*

Beau monde : *persons of fashion, the world of  
fashion, the fashionable world.*

Bel-esprit : *a man of wit.* The plural is, beaux-  
esprits : *men of wit.*

Bien entendu : *of course, be it understood, it being  
understood.*

Billet doux : *a love-letter.*

Bon mot : *a piece of wit, a witticism, or, witty saying.*

Bon ton : *in high fashion, in good taste.*

Bon gré mal gré : *willing or unwilling, whether one  
will or not.*

Bonjour : *good day; good morning.*

Bonsoir : *good evening; good night.*

Boudoir : *a lady's small private apartment.*

Bref : *in short.*

Carte blanche : *unconditional terms : power to act according to one's own discretion.* N.B. "*Carte blanche*," literally means a blank card, or, ticket; a card, or, ticket not written on.

Chateau : *a country seat, abode, or, residence.*

Chef d'oeuvre : *a master-piece.*

Ci-devant : *formerly : my ci-devant preceptor, that is, my former preceptor.*

Comme il faut : *properly, as it should be.*

Congé d'élire : *generally used in reference to the election of a bishop or a dean : permission to choose, or, elect.*

Coup de grâce : *the finishing stroke.*

Coup d'oeil : *a glance.*

Coup de main : *a sudden, or, bold enterprise, undertaking.*

Coup d'état : *a stroke of state policy.*

Début : *a first appearance in public: in the fashionable world, a coming out.*

Dépôt : *a storehouse.*

Douceur : *a present, in return for a situation, or, appointment, procured by private influence: in other words, a bribe.* N.B. The word is used in FRANCE, simply to mean reward, profit, or, gratuity.

Dieu et mon droit : *GOD and my right.*

Eclat : *distinction, applause.*

Elève : *a pupil.*

Enfin : *at length—at last.*

En masse : *in a body, or, mass.*

En passant : *by the way, often applied to a remark casually made.*

Ennui: *wearisomeness, lassitude, inability for exertion.*

Faux pas: *a deviation from the path of virtue, an act of indiscretion: literally, a false step.*

Fête: *a festival: entertainment.*

Fracas: *a fuss about a trifle, or, a mere nothing, a hubbub.*

Honi soit qui mal y pense: *evil be to him, that evil thinks.*

Hauteur: *haughtiness: a ridiculous affectation of pride and reserve.*

Je ne sais quoi: *I know not what: an expression applied to something, that cannot well be described—that baffles description.*

Jeu de mots: *a play upon words.*

Jeu d'esprit: *a display of wit: a witticism.*

Mal à propos: *unseasonable, ill-timed, out of place.*

Mauvaise honte: *sheepishness, extreme bashfulness.*

Mot du guet: Mot de passe: *a watchword.*

Naïveté: *artlessness, unstudied simplicity, ingenuousness, innocence.*

Outré: *outrageous; out of all reason, or, character: unreasonable: preposterous.* N.B. The word is used in FRANCE simply to mean *exaggerated*.

Petit maître: *a fop: a coxcomb: a puppy.*

Protégé: *one, who is patronized, and whose interest is promoted by a person of rank.* N.B. The feminine is *protégée*.

Rouge: *red: a kind of paint, sometimes used by ladies for painting their cheeks.*

Sans: *without.*

Sang-froid: *coolness, indifference—"he heard the*



news with the greatest *sang-froid*," that is to say, "he took it *very easily*"—or, he listened to it *with the greatest composure*.

Savant : *a learned man : a man of science : one of the literati, that is, one of the learned world.*

N.B. The plural of *savant* is *savants, learned men, men of science.*

Soi-disant : *self-styled : a pretender to knowledge or rank ; as, a soi-distant colonel : a soi-distant mathematician. The epithet is often applied to literary quacks.*

Tapis : *carpet ; "the affair is on the tapis," that is, "the affair is in agitation, in contemplation."*

Trait : *feature, a touch of character.*

Tête-à-tête : *a private conversation between two persons.*

Unique : "the book is *unique*," that is, "*is the only one in existence.*"

Valet-de-chambre : *a man, who attends a gentleman, who is dressing himself.*

Vive le roi : *long live the king !*

## ON ABBREVIATIONS.

A.B. or B.A. <i>artium bacca-</i>	B.C. before Christ.
<i>laureus</i> , bachelor of arts.	B.D. bachelor of divinity.
Adj. adjective.	Benj. Benjamin.
Adv. adverb.	Bp. bishop.
Ans. answer.	
Abp. archbishop.	Capt. captain.
Acct. account.	Chas. Charles.
A.C. <i>ante Christum</i> , be-	C. or cent. a hundred.
fore Christ.	Chron. Chronicles.
A.D. <i>anno Domini</i> , in the	Co. company; county.
the year of our Lord.	Col. colonel.
Adm. administrator.	Coll. college.
A.M. <i>ante meridiem</i> , be-	Cor. Corinthians.
fore noon; or, <i>anno</i>	Cr. credit, or creditor.
<i>mundi</i> , in the year of	Cwt. hundred weight.
the world; or, <i>artium</i>	
<i>magister</i> , master of	D. [d.] <i>denarius</i> , a penny,
arts.	or pence.
Anon. anonymous.	D.D. doctor of divinity.
Apr. April.	Dec. December.
A.U.C. <i>anno urbis con-</i>	Deg. degree, or, degrees.
<i>ditae</i> , in the year of the	Dep. deputy.
city [Rome].	Deut. Deuteronomy.
Aug. August.	Do. or ditto, the same.
	Doz. dozen.
Bart. baronet.	Doct. doctor.
Bl. barrel.	Dr. debtor; doctor.

Dwt. pennyweight.	Hon. honorable.
	Hund. hundred.
E. east.	
Eccl. Ecclesiastes.	Ib. or Ibid. <i>ibidem</i> , in the
Ed. editor ; edition.	same place.
E. g. <i>exempli gratia</i> , for	Id. <i>Idem</i> , the same.
example.	I. e. <i>id est</i> , that is.
Eph. Ephesians.	Incog. <i>incognito</i> ,
Esq. esquire	known.
Etc. <i>et cetera</i> , and so on.	Inst. instant, <i>i. e.</i> present
Ex. Exodus ; example.	or, of this month.
Exr. executor.	Isa. Isaiah.
Feb. February.	Jan. January.
Fig. figure.	Jas. or Ja. James.
Fol. folio.	Jno. John.
Fr. French.	Jona. Jonathan.
F.R.S. fellow of the Royal	Jos. Joseph.
Society.	Josh. Joshua.
	Jun. or Jr. junior.
Gal. Galatians.	
Gall. gallon.	Kt. Knight.
Gen. Genesis ; general.	
Gent. gentleman.	Lam. Lamentations.
Geo. George.	Lat. latitude.
Gov. governor.	Lev. Leviticus.
	Lieut. lieutenant.
Heb. Hebrews.	LL.B. <i>legum baccalau-</i>
Hhd. hoghead.	<i>reus</i> , bachelor of laws.
H.M. His or Her Majesty.	LL.D. <i>legum doctor</i> , doc-
H.B.M. His or Her Bri-	tor of laws.
tanic Majesty.	Lon. longitude.

L.S. <i>locus sigilli</i> , the place of the seal.	Num. Numbers. N.W. north-west.
M. <i>mille</i> , a thousand.	Obt. obedient.
M.A. master of arts.	Oct. October.
Maj. Major.	O.S. old style.
Mar. March.	Oxon. <i>Oxonia</i> , Oxford.
Matt. Matthew.	Oz. ounce, <i>or</i> ounces.
M.B. <i>medicine baccalaureus</i> , bachelor of medicine.	Per cent. <i>per centum</i> , by the hundred.
M.D. <i>medicinae doctor</i> , doctor of medicine.	Pet. Peter. Pl. plural.
Messrs. Messieurs.	P.M. post-master.
M.P. member of Parliament.	P.M. <i>post meridiem</i> , afternoon.
Mr. Mister.	P.O. post office.
Mrs. Mistress.	Prob. problem.
M.S. manuscript.	Prof. professor.
MSS. manuscripts.	Prop. proposition.
N. north.	P.S. <i>post scriptum</i> , post-script.
N.B, <i>nota bene</i> , take particular notice.	Ps. psalms.
N.E. North-east.	Q. <i>or</i> qu. question.
Nem. con. <i>nemine contradicente</i> , no one opposing.	Q.E.D. <i>quod erat demonstrandum</i> , which was to be demonstrated.
No. number.	
Nov. November.	Q. v. <i>quod vide</i> , which see.
N.S. new style.	Qr. quarter.
N.T. New Testament.	Qt. quart.

Rev. reverend; Revela- tion	Ult. <i>ultimo</i> [last,] the last month.
R.N. royal navy.	U.S. United States.
Robt. Robert.	
Rom. Romans.	V. or vid. <i>vide</i> , see.
Rt. Hon. right honorable.	Viz. <i>videlicet</i> , to wit namely,
S. South.	Vol. volume.
Sec. Secretary.	Vols. volumes.
S.E. South-east.	Vs. <i>versus</i> , against.
Sen. senior.	
Sept. September.	W. west.
Sq. square.	W. I. West Indies.
St. saint; street.	Wk. week.
S.T.D. <i>sanctae theologiae</i> <i>doctor</i> , doctor of theo- logy, or divinity.	Wm. William. Wt. weight.
S.W. south-west.	Yd. yard. Yds. yards.
Thess. Thessalonians.	
Thos. Thomas.	4to. quarto.
Tim. Timothy.	8vo. octavo.
Tit. Titus.	12mo. duodecimo.
Tr. translator; treasurer.	18mo. octodecimo



COMMON MISTAKES, THAT OCCUR DAILY, IN  
SPEAKING, WRITING, AND PRONUN-  
CIATION, CORRECTED AND  
EXPLAINED.

“We must never offend against Grammar; nor make use of words which are not really words. This is not all: for not to speak ill is not sufficient; we must speak well. Vulgarism in language is a distinguishing characteristic of bad company, and a bad education.”—LORD CHESTERFIELD.

1. HAVE you *learned* French yet? say, *learnt*, as *learned* is now used only as an adjective: as, a *learned man*: pronounce *learned* in two syllables.

2. The business would suit any one who *enjoys bad health*: [from an advertisement in a New York newspaper:] say, any one *in a delicate state of health*, or, *whose health is but indifferent*.

3. “We have no *corporeal* punishment here,” said a schoolmaster once to the author of this little work: *corporeal* is opposed to *spiritual*: say, *corporal* punishment. *Corporeal* means *having a body*. The Almighty is not a *corporeal* being, but a *Spirit*, as St. John tells us.

4. I offered to *renumerate* him: say, *remunerate*.

5. We keep them at various *prices*: pronounce *prices* exactly as written, and not *prizes*.

6. That was a *notable* circumstance: pronounce the first syllable of *notable* as *no* in *notion*: Mrs. Johnson is a *notable* housewife, that is to say, *careful*: pronounce the first syllable of *notable* as *not* in *Nottingham*.

7. Put an *advertisement* in the “Herald:” pro-

nounce *advertisement* with the accent on *ver* and not on *tise*.

8. He *rose up*, and left the room : leave out *up*.

9. *Set down*, and rest yourself: say, *sit down*.

10. You have *sown* it very badly: say, *sowed* it.

11. Between *you and I* he is not very generous : say, *you and me*.

12. Let *you and I* take a walk : say, Let *you and me*. Who would think of saying, *Let I go*?

13. I *lay down* in the afternoon for an hour or two : say, I *lie down*.

14. Mr. Dupont *learnt* me French : say, *taught*. The master *teaches*, but the pupil *learns*.

15. John and Henry both read well, but John is the *best* reader : say, the *better* reader, as *best* can only be said when *three or more* persons or objects are compared.

16. The *two first* pupils I had : say, the *first two*.

17. He has *mistook* his true interest : say, *mistaken*.

18. Have you *lit* the fire, Mary? say, *lighted*.

19. The doctor *has not yet came* : say, *is not yet come*.

20. I have always *gave* him good advice : say, *given*.

21. To be is an *auxiliary* verb : pronounce *auxiliary* in *five* syllables, sounding the second *i*, and not in *four*, as we so frequently hear it.

22. He is *librarian* to a public institution : sound the *first r* distinctly : the word is often pronounced *libarian*.

23. Constable's *Miscellany* was an interesting publication: pronounce *miscellany* with the accent on *mis* and *not* on *cel*.

24. *Celery* is a pleasant edible: pronounce *celery* as it is written, and *not salary*.

25. Are you at *leisure*? pronounce *lei* in *leisure* the same as *Lei* in *Leith* and *not* so as to rhyme with *measure*.

26. Have you seen the *Miss Browns* lately? say, *the Misses Brown*.

27. You have soon *forgot* my kindness: say, *forgotten*.

28. He keeps *his coach*: say, *his carriage*.

29. John is my *oldest* brother: say, *eldest*: *elder* and *eldest* are applied to *persons*—*older* and *oldest* to *things*.

30. Disputes have frequently *arose* on that subject: say, *arisen*.

31. The cloth was *wove* in a very short time: say, *woven*.

32. French is *spoke* in every state in Europe: say, *spoken*.

33. He writes as the best authors would have *wrote*, had they *writ* on the same subject: say, would have *written*—had they *written*.

34. I prefer the *yolk* of an egg to the white: say, *yelk*, and sound the *l*.

35. He is now very *decrepid*: say, *decrepit*.

36. I am very fond of *sparrowgrass*: say, *asparagus*, and pronounce it with the accent on *par*.

37. You are very *mischievous*: pronounce *mis-*

*chievous* with the accent on *mis*, and *not* on *chie*, and do not say *mischievous*.

38. It was very *acceptable*: pronounce *acceptable* with the accent on *cept*, and *not* on *ac*, as we so often hear it.

39. *That depends*: say, *that depends on circumstances*.

40. "No conversation be permitted in the Reading Room to the interruption of the company present: *neither Smoking or Refreshments* allowed:" [from the Prospectus of a "Literary and Scientific Institution:"] insert *can* after *conversation*, and say, *neither Smoking nor Refreshments*.

41. *No extras or vacations*: [from the prospectus of a schoolmistress,] say, *neither extras nor vacations*.

42. He is very covetous: pronounce *covetous* as if it were written *covet us*, and *not* *covetyus*, as is almost universally the case.

43. I intend to *summons* him: say, *summmmon*: *summons* is a noun, and *not* a verb.

44. He does not learn *arithmetic*: say, *arith-metic*, and pronounce it with the accent on *rith*, and *never* on *met*, as we sometimes hear it.

44. Dearly *beloved* brethren: pronounce *beloved* in *three* syllables, and *never* in *two*, as some clergymen do.

46. He is now *forsook* by every one: say, *for-saken*.

47. Not *as I know*: say, *that I know*.

48. This is *different* to that: say, *different from*.

49. He came *for to do* it : leave out *for*.

50. The book *lays* on the table : say, *lies*. A person *lays* a book on the table, but the book *lies* on the table.

51. He would never believe *but what* I did it : say, *but that* I did it.

52. They have just *rose* from the table : say, *risen*.

53. He is quite *as good as me* : say, *as good as I*.

54. *Many an One* has done the same : say, *many a one*. *A*, and not *an*, is used before the *long sound of u*, that is to say, when *u* forms a *distinct syllable of itself*: as, *a unit, union, a university* ; it is also used before *a eu*: as, *a euphony*, and likewise before the word *ewe*: as, *a ewe*: we should also say, *a youth*, not *an youth*.

55. *Many people* think so : say, *Many persons*, as *people* means *a nation*.

56. "When our ships sail among the *people* of the Eastern islands, *those people* do not ask for gold : 'iron, iron!' is the call." [From a work by a Peer of literary celebrity.] Say, among the *inhabitants*; and, instead of *those people*, which is ungrammatical, say, *those persons*. *These kind*, and *these sort*, are very objectionable expressions, as they are altogether incorrect: say, *this kind, this sort*.

57. *Was you* reading just now? say *Were you*.

58. He has *ran* all the way : say, *run*.

59. You should have *went* home: say, *gone*.

60. *Him and me* took a nice walk : say, *He and I*.

61. John went with *James and I*: say, *James and me*.



62. I have *not had no dinner yet* : say, *I have had no dinner yet*, or *I have not yet had my dinner*, or, *any dinner*.

63. She will *never be no taller* : say, *she will never be taller*, or, *she will never be any taller*.

64. I *see him* last Monday : say, *saw him*.

65. The weather is now *much more warmer* : say, *much warmer*.

66. He was *averse from* such a proceeding : say, *averse to*.

67. He has *wore* his boots three months : say, *worn*.

68. He has *trod* on my toes : say, *trodden*.

69. Have you *shook* the cloth ? say, *shaken*.

70. I have *rang* several times : say *rung*.

71. I *knowed* him at once : say, *knew*.

72. He has *growed* very much : say, *grown*.

73. George has *fell* down stairs : say, *fallen*.

74. You have *drank* too much of it : say, *drunk*.

75. He has *chose* a very poor pattern : say *chosen*.

76. They have *broke* a window : say, *broken*.

77. I have just *began* my letter : say, *begun*.

78. Give me *them books* : say, *those books*.

79. My brother gave me *them there pictures* : say, gave me *those pictures*.

80. Whose are *these here books* ? say, *these books*.

81. *Who* do you mean ? say, *Whom*.

82. The men *which* we saw : say, *whom*.

88. The books, *what* you have : say, *which*, or *that*.

84. The boy *as* is reading : say, *who* is reading.

85. It was *them* who did it : say, *they*.

86. *It is me* who am in fault: say, *It is I*.

87. Was it *her* who called me? say, *she*.

88. If I were *her* I would accept his offer: say, If I were *she*.

89. The pond is *froze*: say, *frozen*.

90. He has *took* my slate: say, *taken*.

91. I know *I am him*, whom he meant: say, *I am he*.

92. He has often *stole* money from him: say, *stolen*.

93. They have *drove* very fast: say, *driven*.

94. I have *rode* many miles to-day: say, *ridden*.

95. You cannot *catch* him: pronounce *catch* so as to rhyme with *match*, and not *ketch*.

96. Who has *got* my slate? leave out *got*.

97. What are you *doing of*? leave out *of*.

98. *Who done it*? say, *Who did it*?

99. *If I was rich*, I would buy a carriage: say, *if I were*.

100. We have all within us an *impetus* to sin: pronounce *impetus* with the accent on *im*, and not on *pe*, as is very often the case.

101. "*Who's got this boy's Grammar book?*" a common expression in schools: say, *Who has this boy's Grammar?*

102. We amuse ourselves with *gymnastic* exercises: pronounce *gym* as *gim* in the word *gimlet*, and not *jim*.

103. Spain and Portugal form a *peninsula*: pronounce *peninsula* with the accent on *in*, and not on *su*, as we often hear it.

104. *Sardanapalus*: pronounce it with the ac-

cent on *pa*, and *not* on *ap*, as is almost universally the case.

105. He may go to the *antipodes* for what I care : pronounce *antipodes* with the accent on *tip*, and let *des* rhyme with *ease* : it is a word of *four* syllables, and *not of three*, as most persons make it.

106. *Vouchsafe* : a word seldom used, but when used, the first syllable should rhyme with *pouch* : *never say, vouseafe*.

107. Ginger is a good *stomachic* : pronounce *stomachic* with the accent on *mach*, sounding this syllable *mak*, and *not mat*, as is often the case.

108. The land in those parts is very *fertile* : pronounce *fertile* so as to rhyme with *pill*. 'The *ile* in all words must be sounded *ill*, with the exception of *exile*, *senile*, *gentile*, *reconcile*, and *camomile*, in which *ile* rhymes with *mile*.

109. *It is surprising the fatigue he undergoes* : say, *The fatigue he undergoes is surprising*.

110. *Benefited* : often spelt *benefitted*, but *incorrectly*.

111. *Gather up the fragments* : pronounce *gather* so as to rhyme with *lather*, and not *gether*.

112. I bought yesterday a *quantity of books* : say, *a number of books* ; *quantity* can only be used in answer to the question, *how much ?* " *number* in answer to the question, " *how many ?* "

113. I *propose* going to town next week : say, *purpose*.

114. If I *am not mistaken*, you are in the wrong : say, If I *mistake not*.

115. *Direct* your letters to me at Mr. Jones's: say, *Address* your letters.

116. "*He didn't ought to have his salary rose*," said a schoolmistress in reference to the minister of the chapel she attended: say, *He ought not to have his salary raised*.

117. *Who* do you think I saw yesterday? say *Whom*.

118. Wales is a very *mountainious* country: say, *mountainous*, and place the accent on *moun*.

119. Of two evils choose *the least*: say, *the less*.

120. *Exag'gerate*: pronounce *exad'gerate*, and do not sound *agger* as in the word *dagger* which is a very common mistake.

121. *Ladies school*: the *usual* form, but *not correct*: write, *Ladies' school*.

122. He knows *little or nothing of Latin*: say, *little, if anything, of Latin*.

123. *Decorous, indecorous, dedecorous*: in the *first* and *second* words lay the accent on the syllable *co*: in the *last* word lay it on the second syllable, *de*.

124. He keeps a *chaise*: pronounce it *shaise*, and not *shay*; it has a regular plural *chaises*.

125 The *drought* lasted a long time: pronounce *drought* so as to rhyme with *snout*, and not *drowth*.

126. The man was *hung* last week: say, *hanged*: but say, I am fond of *hung beef*. *Hang*, to take away life by hanging, is a regular verb.

127. We *conversed together* on the subject: leave out *together*, as it is implied in *conversed*, *con* being equivalent to *with*, that is to say, *We talked with each other*, &c.

128. The affair was *compromised*: pronounce *com-promised* in three syllables, and place the accent on *com*, sounding *mised* like *prized*: the word has nothing to do with *promised*. The noun *compromise* is accented like *compromised*, but *mise* must be pronounced *mice*.

129. A *steam-engine*: pronounce *engine* with *en*, as in *pen*, and not like *in*, and *gine* like *gin*.

130. Numbers were *massacred*: pronounce *massacred* with the accent on *mas*, and *red* like *erd*, as if *mas'saker'd*, never *mas'sacreed*.

131. The king of Israël and the king of Judah sat *either of them* on his throne: say *each of them*. *Either* signifies the *one* or the *other*, but not *both*. *Each* relates to *two or more objects*, and signifies *both of the two*, or *every one of any number taken singly*. Never say, "*either of the three*," but "*each of the three*."

132. A *respite* was granted the convict: pronounce *respite* with the accent on *res*, and sound *pite* as *pit*.

133. He soon *returned back*: leave out *back*, which is implied by *re* in *returned*.

134. The *horizon* is the line, that terminates the view: pronounce *horizon* with the accent on *ri*, and not on *ho*, which is often the case.

135. That is *St. Sepulchre's Church*: pronounce *Sepulchre's* with the accent on *Sep*, and not on the *second syllable*.

136. The meat is quite *rere*: pronounce *rere* as *mere*, and never like *rare*.

137. She has *sang* remarkably well: say, *sung*.

138. He had *sank* before assistance arrived: say, *sunk*.



139. I have often *swam* across the Hudson : say, *swum*.

140. I found my friend better than I expected *to have found him* : say, *to find him*.

141. I intended *to have written* a letter yesterday : say, *to write*, as however long it now is since I thought of writing, "*to write*" was then present to me, and must still be considered as present, when I bring back that time and the thoughts of it.

142. I learn *drawing* : carefully avoid inserting an *r* between words or syllables, of which the former ends with a vowel, and the latter begins with one : thus, do not say, *drawring* for *drawing*, I *sawr* Anne yesterday, for I *saw*, &c.

143. His death *shall be* long regretted : [from a notice of a death in a newspaper :] say, *will be* long, &c. *Shall* and *will* are often confounded ; the following rule, however, may be of use to the reader : mere *futurity* is expressed by *shall* in the *first* person, and by *will* in the *second* and *third* : the *determination* of the speaker by *will* in the *first*, and *shall* in the *second* and *third*, as, I **WILL** go to-morrow, I **SHALL** go to-morrow. N. B. The latter sentence simply expresses a future event ; the former expresses my determination.

144. "*Without* the grammatical form of a word can be recognized at a glance, little progress can be made in reading the language" [from a very popular work on the study of the Latin language] : say, *Unless* the grammatical, &c. The use of *without* for *unless* is a very common mistake.

145. Have you begun *substraction* yet ? say, *subtraction*.

146. He claimed admission to the *chiefest* offices : say, *chief*. *Chief, right, supreme, correct, true, universal, perfect, consummate, extreme, &c., imply* the superlative degree without *est* or *most*. In language impassioned, however, the word *perfect* requires the superlative form to give it effect. A lover, enraptured with his mistress, would naturally call her the *most perfect* of her sex.

147. The ship had *sprang* a leak : say, *sprung*.

148. I *had* rather do it now : say, I *would* rather.

149. He was served with a *subpæna* : pronounce *subpæna* with the accent on *pæ*, which you will sound like *tea*, and sound the *b* distinctly : *never pronounce the word soopee'na*.

150. His *court-of-arms* is very splendid, say *coat-of-arms*.

151. Dr. Evans is one of the *prebends* : say *pe-bendaries*.

152. They ride about in small carriages, which are called *flies* : write the last word *flys* : *flies* is the plural of *fly*, the insect.

153. I have not travelled *this twenty years* : say *these twenty years*.

154. He is *very much the gentleman* : say, He is *a very gentlemanly man*, or *fellow*.

155. The *yellow* part of an egg is very nourishing : *never* pronounce *yellow* the same as *tallow*, which we so often hear.

156. We are going to the *Zoological Institute* : pronounce *Zoological* in five syllables, and place the accent on *log* in *logical* : sound *log* like *lodge*,

and the first two o's in distinct syllables: never make *Zool* one syllable.

157. He *strived* to obtain an appointment: say, *strove*.

158. He always preaches EXTEMPORE: pronounce EXTEMPORE in four syllables, with the accent on *tem*, and never in three, making *pore* to rhyme with *sore*.

159. *Naught* and *ought*: never spell these words *nought* and *ought*: there is no such word as *nought*, and *ought* is a verb.

160. Allow me to *suggest*: pronounce *sug-* so as to rhyme with *mug*, and *gest* like *jest*: never *sud-jest*.

161. That building is an *episcopal* chapel: pronounce *episcopal* with the accent on *pis*, and not on *co*, as we often hear it.

162. The Emperor of Russia is a *formidable* personage: pronounce *formidable* with the accent on *for*, and not on *mid*, as is often the case.

163. Before the words *heir*, *herb*, *honest*, *honour*, *hospital*, *hostler*, *hour*, *humble*, and *humour*, and their compounds, instead of the article *a*, we make use of *an*, as the *h* is not sounded: likewise before words beginning with *H*, that are not accented on the first syllable: such as *heroic*, *historical*, *hypothesis*, &c., as *an heroic action*: *an historical work*: *an hypothesis* that can scarcely be allowed. N.B. The letter *H* is seldom mute at the beginning of a word: but from the negligence of tutors, and the inattention of pupils, many persons have become almost incapable of acquiring its just and full pronunciation. It is, therefore, incumbent on teachers

to be particularly careful to inculcate a clear and distinct utterance of this sound.

164. He *was such an extravagant young man*, that he soon spent his whole patrimony : say, *so extravagant a young man*.

165. The girl speaks *distinct* : say, *distinctly*.  
*Never use Adjectives as Adverbs.*

166. He was reading the "Times," when the train stopped at "*Reading*:" pronounce "*Reading*" so as to rhyme with *dreading*.

167. In a field near "*Slough*" I met with the *slough* of a snake: pronounce the former "*Slough*" so as to rhyme with *bough*, the latter *slough* with *rough*.

168. The queen took an airing with her *august* mother last *August* : pronounce the former *august* with the accent on *gust*.

169. She is *quite the lady* : say, She is *very lady-like in her demeanour*.

170. He is *seldom or ever* out of town : say, *seldom, if ever*, out of town.

171. We *laid down* to sleep : say, *we lay down*, &c.

172. Death *unloosed* his chains : say, *loosed* his chains.

173. It is dangerous to walk *of a* slippery morning : say *on a* slippery morning.

174. He, who makes himself famous by his eloquence, illustrates his origin, let it be *never so mean* : say, *ever so mean*.

175. His fame is acknowledged *through* Europe : say, *throughout* Europe.

176. The bank of the river is frequently *overflowed*: say, *overflowed*.

177. *Previous* to my leaving England I called on his lordship: say, *previously* to my leaving, &c.

178. I doubt *if this* will ever reach you: say, *whether this*, &c.

179. It is not improbable *but I may be* able to procure you a copy: say, *that I may*, &c.

180. He was *exceeding kind* to me: say *exceedingly kind*.

181. I doubt not *but I shall be* able: say, *that I shall*.

182. I lost *near* ten dollars: say, *nearly*.

183. *Bills are requested to be paid quarterly*: say, *It is requested that bills be paid quarterly*.

184. There can be no doubt *but that* he will succeed: leave out *but*.

185. It was *no use asking* him any more questions: say, *of no use to ask him* &c.

186. I *throwed* my box away, and *never took no more snuff*: say, *I threw* &c., and *took snuff no more*.

187. The estate was to have been sold *as this day*: leave out *as*.

188. She was *endowed* with an exquisite taste for music: say, *endued* with &c.

189. I intend to *stop* at home: say, *to stay*.

190. At this time I *grew* my own corn: say, *I raised* &c.

191. He *was* no sooner departed than they expelled his officers: say, *he had* no sooner &c.

192. He *was* now retired from public business: say, *had* now retired &c.



193. They *were* embarked in a common cause : say, *had* embarked &c.

194. Having incautiously *laid down* on the damp grass, he had caught a severe cold : say, *lain down*.

195. We suffered no other inconvenience *but* that arising from cold : say, *than* that &c.

196. Hostilities *were* now become habitual : say, *had* now become.

197. Brutus and Aruns killed *one another* : say, *each other*.

198. Pray, Sir, *who may you be?* say, *who are you?*

199. Their character as a warlike people *is* much degenerated : say, *has* much &c.

200. He is gone on an *errand* : pronounce *errand* as it is written, and not *arrand*.

201. In a popular work on Arithmetic, published by order of certain Commissioners of National Education, we find the following sum: "If for \$1 I can buy 9 lbs. of raisins, *how much* can I purchase for \$10?" say, "*what quantity* can I" &c. Who would think of saying, "*how much raisins?*" &c.

202. Be very careful in distinguishing between *indite* and *indict*; *key* and *quay*; *principle* and *principal*; *check* and *cheque*; *marshal* and *martial*; *counsel* and *council*; *counsellor* and *councillor*; *fort* and *forte*; *draft* and *draught*; *place* and *plaice*; *stake* and *steak*; *satire* and *satyr*; *stationery* and *stationary*; *ton* and *tun*; *levy* and *levee*; *foment* and *ferment*; *fomentation* and *fermentation*; *petition* and *partition*; *practice* and *practise*; *Francois* and *Frances*; *dose* and *doze*; *divcrse* and *di-*

*vers* ; *device* and *devise* ; *wary* and *weary* ; *salary* and *celery* ; *radish* and *reddish* ; *treble* and *triple* ; *broach* and *brooch* ; *ingenious* and *ingenuous* ; *prophecy* and *prophecy* ; *fondling* and *foundling* ; *lightning* and *lightening* ; *genus* and *genius* ; *desert* and *dessert* ; *currier* and *courier* ; *pillow* and *pillar* ; *executer* and *executor* ; *suit* and *suite* ; *ridicule* and *recticule* ; *lineament* and *liniment* ; *track* and *tract* ; *lickerish* and *licorice* ; *statute* and *statue* ; *ordinance* and *ordnance* ; *lease* and *leash* ; *recourse* and *resource* ; *straight* and *strait* ; *immerge* and *emerge* ; *style* and *stile* ; *compliment* and *complement* ; *bass* and *base* ; *contagious* and *contiguous* ; *eminent* and *imminent* ; *eruption* and *irruption* ; *precedent* and *president* ; *relic* and *relict*.

203. I prefer *radishes* to *cucumbers* : pronounce *radishes* exactly as spelt, and not *redishes*, and the first syllable of *cucumber* like *du* in *duel*, and not as if the word were *cowcumber*.

204. Never pronounce *barbarous* and *grievous*, *barbarious* and *grievious*.

205. The *two last* chapters are very interesting : say, The *last two* &c.

206. The soil on these islands is so very thin, that little vegetation is produced upon them *beside* cocoa-nut trees : say, *with the exception of* &c.

207. He restored it *back* to the owner : leave out *back*.

208. The following expressions are by some persons considered objectionable : they are, however, so far sanctioned by custom, that any deviation from them would be looked on as pedantic : *He*

*lives opposite the church ; the very best ; the very worst ; he need not go ; she dare not come ; this house to let ; he could neither read nor write ; they were bred and born in New York ;* some writers would have us say, *opposite to, &c. ; the best and the worst, leaving out very ; he needs not, &c. ; she dares not, &c. ; to be let, neither write nor read ; born and bred, &c.*

209. *Here, there, where,* are generally better than *hither, thither, whither,* with verbs of motion : as “ *Come here, Go there.* N.B. *Hither, thither* and *whither,* which were used formerly, are now considered stiff and inelegant.

210. *As far as I am* able to judge, the book is well written : say, *So far as &c.*

211. It is doubtful whether he will play *fairly* or *no* : say *fairly* or *not.*

212. “The Pilgrim’s *Progress* :” pronounce *Progress, prog-ress,* not *pro-gress.*

213. He is a boy of a great *spirit* : pronounce *spirit* exactly as it is written, and never *sperit.*

214. The *camelopard* is the tallest of known animals : pronounce *camelopard* with the accent on the *second* syllable ; never call it *camel leopard,* as is so often heard.

215. He is very *awkward* : never say, *awkard.*

216. He ran *again* me : I stood *again* the wall : instead of *again,* say, *against.* Do it *again* the time I mentioned : say, *by* the time &c.

217. I always act *agreeable* to my promise : say, *agreeably.*

218. The study of Syntax should be *previously* to that of Punctuation : say, *previous*.

219. No one should incur censure for being tender of *their* reputation : say of *his* reputation.

220. They were all *drownded* : say, *drowned*.

221. *Jalap* is of great service : pronounce *Jalap* exactly as it is written : NEVER *Jollop*.

222. His *curiosity* is unbounded : pronounce *curiosity* in *five* syllables, and *never* say *curosimy*.

223. He is gone on a *tour* : pronounce *tour* so as to rhyme with *poor*, *never* like *tower*.

224. The rain *is* ceased : say, *has* ceased.

225. Do you know *who* this book belongs to? say, *whom* &c., or *to whom* this book belongs?

226. *Who* did you inquire for? say, *Whom*, or *For whom* did you inquire?

227. *Whom* say ye that I am? say, *Who* say ye &c.

228. Do you know *who* you are speaking to? say, *whom* &c., or, Do you know *to whom* &c.

229. *They laid their heads together*, and formed their plan : say, *They held a consultation* &c.; "*laid their heads together*" savours of SLANG.

230. The *chimley* wants sweeping : say, *chimney*.

231. I was walking *towards* home : pronounce *wards* so as to rhyme with *boards*, *never* say *towards*.

232. It is a *stupenduous* work : say, *stupendous*.

233. A *courier* is expected from Paris : pronounce *cou* in *courier* so as to rhyme with *too* ; *never* pronounce *courier* like *currier*.

234. Let each of us mind *their* own business : say, *his* own business.

235. Who made that noise? Not *me*: say, Not *I*.

236. Is this or that the *best* road? say, the *better* road.

237. *Rinse* your mouth: pronounce *rinse* as it is written, and NEVER *rense*. "*Wrench your mouth*," said a fashionable dentist one day to the author of this work.

238. He was tired of New York, and *flew* into the country: say, *fled*.

239. The book is not *as* well printed as it ought to be: say, *so* well printed &c.

240. "We don't like our *parson*," an expression often used contemptuously: let those, however, who make use of it ruminate on what Judge Blackstone says in reference to the word *parson*: "The appellation of a *parson* (however it may be depreciated by familiar, clownish, and indiscriminate use) is the most legal, most beneficial, and most honourable title that a parish priest can enjoy; because such a one, (as Sir Edward Coke observes,) and he only. is said *vicem seu personam ecclesiæ gerere*," that is to say, *to represent, or, be the representative of, the church*.

341. Webster's *Dictionary* is an admirable work: pronounce *Dictionary* as if written *Dik-shun-ary*: not, as is too commonly the practice, *Dixonary*.

242. I should be sorry to be *beholding* to him: say, *beholden*.

243. He is a *despicable* fellow, and such an epithet is strictly *applicable* to him: never place the accent in *despicable* and *applicable* on the *second* syllable, but *always* on the *first*.



244. Some disaster has certainly *befell* him ; say, *befallen*.

245. Carefully distinguish between *sergeant* and *serjeant* : they are both pronounced *sarjant* but the *former* is used in a military sense, the *latter* when applied to a lawyer.

246. The *prologue* is well written : never pronounce *prologue pro-log*, but *prol-log*.

247. He *lays* in bed too long : say, *lies*.

I have a work *laying* by me, ready for the press : say *lying*.

Go and *lay* down on the bed : say, *lie*.

I *laid* and slept an hour : say, *lay*.

I was *laying* on the grass : say, *lying*.

He has *laid* there a long time : say, *lain*.

He has *lain* himself down to rest : say, *laid*.

Let me *set* down : say *sit*.

I then went and *set* down : say *sat*.

The hen is *setting* on her eggs : say, *sitting*.

N.B. To *lay* (something down), in the present tense is *lay*, in the past *laid*, and the participle is also *laid*. To *lie* (down), is *lie* in the present, *lay* in the past, and *lain* (formerly *lien*) in the participle. *Lie* is conjugated regularly, when it means "to tell a falsehood;" as "he *lied* : he *has lied* then."

*Set* is a neuter verb in some senses, which makes it proper to say, "to *set out* on a journey; to *set up* in business; to *set off* from a place; the sun *sets*; and fair weather has *set in*."

248. She is a pretty *creature* : never pronounce *creature*, *creeter*, as is often heard.

249. We went to see the Bunker Hill *Monument* : pronounce *Monument* exactly as it is written, and not as many pronounce it, *Moniment*.

250. *Watercresses* are very wholesome : pronounce *cresses* as it is written, and not *creases*.

251. I am very wet, and must go and *change myself* : say, *change my clothes*.

252. He has had a good *education* : never say, *edication*, which is so often heard, nor *edicate* for *educate*.

253. He is taller *than me* : say, *than I*.

254. He is much better *than me* : say, *than I*.

255. You are stronger *than him* : say, *than he*.

256. I had as *lief* stand : say, *I would as soon stand*.

257. He is *not* a *whit* better ; say, *in no degree better*.

258. They are at *loggerheads* : say, *at variance*.

259. His character is *undeniable* : a very common expression : say, *unexceptionable*.

260. The *florist* showed me a *florin* : never say *flo-ris*t and *flo-rin*, but pronounce the *former* part of each word exactly as in "*Florence*."

261. Bring me the *lantern* : never spell *lantern*—*lanthorn*.

262. The room is twelve *foot* long, and nine *foot* broad : say, twelve *feet*, nine *feet*.

263. He is a *Highlander* : never say *Heelander*.

264. He is *singular*, though *regular* in his habits, and also very *particular* : beware of leaving out

the *u* in *singular*, *regular*, and *particular*, which is a very common practice.

265. They are destined *at* France : say, *in* France.

266. No *less* than fifty persons were there : say, No *fewer* &c.

267. *Such*, *another* mistake, and we shall be ruined : say, *Another such* mistake, &c.

268. It is *some* distance from our house : say, *at some distance* &c.

269. I shall call *upon* him : say, *on* him.

270. Remove those *trestles* : pronounce *trestles* exactly as it is written, only leaving out the *t* : never say *trussles*.

271. He is much addicted to *raillery* : pronounce *raillery* exactly as it is written, only leaving out the *i* : never say, *rail-le-ry*.

272. He is a Doctor of *Medicine* : pronounce *medicine* in *three* syllables, NEVER in *two*.

273. His mother was a *marchioness* : pronounce *marchioness* as if written *march-un-ess*, NEVER *marsh-un-ess*.

274. They told me to *enter in* : leave out *in*, as it is implied in *enter*.

275. His *strength* is amazing : never say, *strenth*.

276. "*Mistaken* souls, who dream of heaven : " This is the beginning of a popular hymn : it should be, "*Mistaking* souls, &c." *Mistaken wretch*, for *mistaking wretch*, is an apostrophe that occurs everywhere among our poets, particularly those of the stage ; the most incorrigible of all, and the most likely to fix and disseminate an error of this kind.

277. Give me both *of* those books : leave out *of*.

278. Whenever I try to write well, I *always* find I can do it: leave out *always*, which is unnecessary.

279. He plunged *down* into the stream: leave out *down*.

280. I never saw his *nephew*: never say *nevvey* for *nephew*, which is very often heard.

281. She is the *matron*: say *may-tron*, and not *mat-ron*.

282. Give me *leave* to tell you: NEVER say *leaf* for *leave*.

283. The *height* is considerable: pronounce *height* so as to rhyme with *tight*: never *hate* nor *heighth*.

284. Who has my *scissors*? never call *scissors*, *sithers*.

285. He has obtained a good *situation*: pronounce *situation* as it is written, and neither *sitia-tion* nor *sitivation*, both by no means unusual.

286. First *of all* I shall give you a lesson in French, and last *of all* in music: leave out *of all* in both instances, as unnecessary.

287. I shall have finished by the *latter* end of the week; leave out *latter*, which is unnecessary.

288. They sought him *throughout* the *whole* country: leave out *whole*, which is implied in *throughout*.

289. Iron sinks *down* in water: leave out *down*.

290. A warrant was *issued out* for his apprehension: leave out the word *out*, which is implied in *issued*.

291. If you inquire *for why* I did so, I can give a very good reason: leave out *for*.

292. I own that I did not come soon enough: but *because why*? I was detained: leave out *because*.

293. Have you seen the new *pantomime*? never say *pantomine*, as there is no such word.

294. I *cannot by no means* allow it: say, I *can by no means* &c.: or, I *cannot by any means* &c.,

295. He *covered it over*: leave out *over*.

296. I bought a new pair of shoes: say, a pair of new shoes.

297. He *combined together* these facts: leave out *together*.

298. My brother called on me, and we *both* took a walk: leave out *both*, which is unnecessary.

299. "Evil spirits are not occupied about the *dead corpses* of bad men:" leave out *dead*, which is altogether unnecessary, as it is *implied* in the word *corpses*, "*corpse*" and "*dead body*" being strictly synonymous. [The sentence is from the pen of a most learned and distinguished living prelate.]

300. He was born in *January*, and she in *February*: pronounce *January* as it is written, and not *Jennivery*, and beware of leaving out the *u* in *February*, or of calling the word *Febbevery*.

301. The *invalid* signed a deed that was *invalid*: pronounce the *former* "invalid" with the accent on the last syllable, sounding *lid* as if it were written *leed*: the *latter*, with the accent on the *second*.

302. He turned him into *ridicule*: Never indulge in *ridicule*: NEVER say, *redicule*.

303. The *duke* discharged his *duty*: sound the *u* in *duke* and *duty* like the word *you*, and carefully avoid saying, *dook* and *dooty*, or *doo* for *dew*.

304. *Genealogy*, *geography*, and *geometry* are words of Greek derivation: beware of saying *gene-*



ology, jography, and jometry, a very common practice.

305. He keeps his *chariot*: pronounce *chariot* in three syllables, and beware of calling the word *char-rut*.

306. He made out the *inventory*: place the accent in *inventory* on the syllable *in*, and NEVER on *ven*.

307. He deserves *chastisement*: say, *chas-tizement* with the accent on *chas*, and NEVER on *tise*.

308. He threw the *rind* away: never call *rind*, *rine*.

309. His *knowledge* is very great: always pronounce *knowledge* so as to rhyme with *college*, and NEVER say, *know-ledge*.

310. They contributed to his *maintenance*: pronounce *maintenance* with the accent on *main*, and never say, *maintainance*.

311. She wears a silk *gown* never say *gownd*.

312. Sussex is a *maritime* county: pronounce the last syllable of *maritime* so as to rhyme with *rim*.

313. They *desisted* from their *design*: pronounce the former *s* in *desisted* like the *s* in *resisted*, and always pronounce *design* as if written *de-zine*, NEVER *de-sign*.

314. They committed a *heinous* crime: pronounce *heinous* so as to rhyme with "*rein us*:" NEVER call the word *heen-nus*.

315. He *hovered* about the enemy: pronounce *hovered* so as to rhyme with *covered*.

316. He is a powerful *ally*: never place the accent on *al* in *ally*, as many do.

317. She bought a *diamond* necklace : pronounce *diamond* in *three* syllables; NEVER in *two*, which is a very common practice.

318. "We have *never* been called *almost* to the consideration of the Apocalypse, without finding fresh reasons for our opinion:" Such are the words of a very eminent Reviewer. He should have said, "We have *scarcely ever* been called" &c.

319. He is very *bigoted* : never spell the last word with *double t*, a very common mistake.

320. He reads the "*Weekly Despatch*" NEVER spell the word *despatch*, *dispatch*.

221. He said *as how* you *was* to do it : say, he said *that you were* to do it.

322. Never say, "*I acquiesce with you*," but, "*I acquiesce in your proposal, in your opinion*," &c.

323. He is a distinguished *antiquarian* : say, *antiquary*. *Antiquarian* is an adjective; *Antiquary*, a noun.

324. A Reviewer expresses himself thus, in reference to Webster's Dictionary of the English Language:—"It is the most complete, accurate, and *reliable* Dictionary of the Language." As an attempt is being made to introduce "*reliable*" to our notice, in the absence of a single word conveying the same idea, the writer of these pages would suggest as a slight improvement the word "RELIONABLE." By-the-by, as the words "complete" and "accurate" imply the superlative degree without *est* or *most*, would not the Reviewer have expressed himself better, had he said, "It is a complete and

accurate Dictionary of the Language, and one on which implicit reliance may be placed."

325. In Goldsmith's "History of England," a book used in nearly every school in the United States, and which is remarkable for its carelessness of style, we find the following extraordinary sentence in one of the chapters of the reign of Queen Elizabeth: "This" [a communication to Mary, Queen of Scots] "they effected by conveying their letters to her by means of a brewer *that supplied the family with ale through a chink in the wall of her apartment.*" A queer brewer that—to supply his ale through a chink in the wall! How easy the alteration to make the passage clear! "This they effected by conveying their letters to her *through a chink in the wall of her apartment, by means of a brewer that supplied the family with ale.*"

326. Lavater wrote on *Physiognomy*: In the last word sound the *g* distinctly, as *g* is always pronounced before *n*, when it is not in the same syllable; as, *indignity* &c.

327. She is a very clever *girl*: pronounce *girl* as if written *gerl*: never say *gal*, which is very vulgar.

328. He built a large *granary*: pronounce *granary* so as to rhyme with *tannery*: never call the word *grainary*.

329. Beware of using *Oh!* and *O* indiscriminately: *Oh!* is used to express the emotion of *pain, sorrow, or surprise*; as, "Oh! the exceeding grace of God, who loves his creatures so." *O* is

used to express *wishing*, *exclamation*, or a direct *address* to a person ; as,

“O mother, will the God above

Forgive my faults like thee?”

330. Some writers make a distinction between *farther* and *further*—they are, in fact, the very same word: *further*, however, is less used than *farther*, though it is the genuine form.

331. *Cider* is made in several counties: never spell *Cider* with a *y*.

332. He did it *unbeknown* to us: say, *unknown* &c.

333. “Equal to *bespoke*,” an expression, that may often be seen in bootmakers’ windows: say, “Equal to *bespoken*.”

334. He lives in *affluence*, as he is in *affluent* circumstances: beware of placing the accent in *affluence* and *affluent* on the syllable *flu*, instead of on *af*: a very common error.

335. If I say, “They retreated *back*,” I use a word, that is *superfluous*, as *back* is implied in the syllable *re* in *retreated*: never place the accent on *flu* in *superfluous*, but always on *per*.

336. In reading Paley’s “Evidences of Christianity,” I unexpectedly *lit on* the passage I wanted: say, *met with* the passage &c.

337. He has ordered a *phaëton* from his coachmaker: beware of saying, *pheton* or *phaton*: the word should always be pronounced in *three* syllables with the accent on *pha*. N.B. In *pha-e-ton* the *a* and *e* do *not* form a diphthong, as many suppose: the word is of Greek origin.

338. In conversing with an unmarried lady, never say, "Yes, *miss*—No, *miss*," which are downright cockneyisms, but, "Yes, *madam*—No, *madam*."

339. "*How's yourself* this morning?" an exceedingly common, but very objectionable expression: say, "*How are you*" &c.

340. "Wanted, two apprentices, who will be treated as *one* of the family:" very common in the advertising columns of the newspapers: say, "Wanted, . . . . as *members* of the family."

341. *Instead of me going* to Baltimore, I went to Richmond: say, *Instead of going* &c., as *me* or *my* is altogether unnecessary.

342. *Broccoli* is a species of cabbage: beware of pronouncing "*broccoli*" *brockilow*, which is so often heard.

343. Be careful in using the hyphen (-) correctly: it joins compound words, and words broken by the ending of the line. The use of the hyphen will appear more clearly from the following example: "*many coloured wings*" means *many* wings, which are *coloured*; but "*many-coloured wings*" means "*wings of many colours*."

344. He had to wait in an *antechamber*: carefully avoid spelling the last word *anti-chamber*. N.B. An *antechamber* is the chamber that leads to the chief apartment. *Ante* is a LATIN PREPOSITION, and means *before*, as to *antedate*, that is "to date beforehand." *Anti* is a GREEK PREPOSITION, and means *against*, as *antimonarchical*, that is, "against government by a single person."



345. The *axe* was very sharp : never spell *axe* without the *e*.

346. The force of voice, which is placed on any particular word or words to distinguish the sense, is called *emphasis*, and those words are called *emphatical words* : as, "Grammar is a *useful* science : " in this sentence the word *useful* is emphatical. The great importance of *emphasis* may be seen by the following example :

1. Will you *call* on me to-morrow ?

Yes, I shall [*call*].

2. Will you call on *me* to-morrow ?

No, but I shall call on your *brother*.

3. Will you call on me *to-morrow* ?

No, but I shall on the *following day*.

4. Will *you* call on me to-morrow ?

No, but my *brother* will.

347. Never say *o-fences* for *offences* ; *pison* for *poison* ; *co-lection* for *collection* ; *voiolent* for *violent* ; *kiver* for *cover* ; *afeard* for *afraid* ; *debbuty* for *deputy* (the last three examples very common in the City of New York).

348. He is a mere *cipher* ; never spell *cipher* with a *y*.

349. I was *necessitated* to do it : a vile expression, and often made worse by *necessiated* being used : say, I was *obliged*, or, *compelled*, to do it.

350. He is a *lunatic* : never place the accent on the *second* syllable of *lunatic*, which is very common in some parts of the Union.

351. Gibbon wrote the "*Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire* : " pronounce *Rise* with the noun, so

as to rhyme with *price*; *Rise*, the verb rhymes with *prize*.

352. He joined his *regiment* last week: never say *ridgiment* for *regiment*.

353. Have you been to the *National* Gallery? Never pronounce *National* as if it were written, *Nay-shun-al*, a very common error, and by no means confined to the lower classes.

354. I bought a new *umbrella*: beware of pronouncing *umbrella*, *umberella*, or, *umbereller*, both very common errors.

355. He bought a *gimlet*; never spell the last word *gimblet*, as many do.

356. He is a supporter of the *Government*: beware of omitting the *n* in the second syllable of *Government*; a very common practice.

357. He strenuously maintained the *contrary*: never place the accent on the *second* syllable in *contrary*. In the ancient and time-honoured ditty, however, of

“Mistress Mary,

Quite *contrary*,

How does your garden grow?”

a ballad with which we are all more or less familiar, the word “*contrary*” is accented on the *second* syllable, so as to rhyme with the name of the venerable dame, to whom these memorable lines were addressed.

358. “Received this day of Mr. Brown, Ten Dollars:” say, “Received this day *from* &c.

359. “What case is the word *dominus*?” “The *nominative*, Sir.” In the hurry of school pronun-

ciation "*nominative*" is nearly always heard in *three* syllables, as if written *nomnative*. or *nomative*, an error, that should be very carefully avoided : it is a word of four syllables.

360. Of whatever you *get*, endeavour to save something ; and, with all your *getting*, *get* wisdom : carefully avoid saying, *git* for *get*, and *gitting* for *getting*.

361. So intent was he on the song he was *singing*, as he stood by the fire, that he did not perceive that his clothes were *singeing*. N.B. Verbs ending with a *single e* omit the *e* when the termination *ing* is added, as, *give*, *giving* ; in *singeing*, however, the *e* must be retained, to prevent its being confounded with *singing*.

362. The boy had a *swingeing* for *swinging* without permission : *Read the preceding note*.

363. The man who was *dyeing*, said that his father was then *dying*. Read the note in 361, in reference to *dyeing*, and observe that *die* changes the *i* into *y* before the addition of the termination *ing*.

364. *Lower* the sails, as the sky begins to *lower* pronounce the *low* in the *former* "lower" so as to rhyme with *mow*, and the *low* in the *latter* "lower" so as to rhyme with *cow*.

365. There was a great *row* on Monday, in *Irving Row* : pronounce the former *row* so as to rhyme with *cow*, the latter *row* so as to rhyme with *mow*.

366. His *surname* is Clifford : never spell the *sur* in *surname* *sir*, which shows an ignorance of its true derivation, which is from the Latin.

367. There is in Greek a mood, that is called the

*optative* mood : In nearly every *professedly classical* school, the word "*optative*" is pronounced with the accent on the *second* syllable, instead of on the *first*; ask the teachers why this is so, and the only reply you will receive will be a stare of amazement at your question. If we place the accent on the *second* syllable of "*optative*," we should, to be consistent, place the accent on the *last syllable but one* in *nominative, accusative, vocative, ablative, imperative, and indicative*.

368. His *mamma* sent him to a preparatory school: *mamma* is often written with one *m* only, which is not, as may at first be supposed, in imitation of the French [*maman*], but in sheer ignorance. The word is pure Greek.

369. Active verbs often take a neuter sense : as, *The house is building* : here, *is building* is used in a neuter signification, because it has no object after it. By this rule are explained such sentences as, *Application is wanting, The Grammar is printing, &c.*

370. He *attackted* me without the slightest provocation : say, *attacked*.

371. You *was* very *duberous* about it : say, you *were* very *dubious* &c.

372. I met him quite *permiscous* : say, quite *accidentally*.

373. I saw him *somewheres* in the city : say *somewhere*. N.B. *Nowhere, everywhere, and anywheres*, are also very frequently heard in New York.

374. He is still a *batcheldor* : say, *bachelor*.

375. His language was quite *blasphemous*: beware of placing the accent on *phe* in *blasphemous*. A very common mistake, and by no means confined to the uneducated. Place the accent on the syllable *blas*.

376. I called on him every day in the week *successfully*; very common, but very incorrect; say, *successively*.

377. He is at home for the *vocation*: say, *vacation*.

378. I fear I shall *discommode* you: say, *incommode*.

379. I can do it *equally* as well as he: leave out *equally*, which is altogether superfluous.

380. We could not forbear *from* doing it: leave out *from* which is unnecessary.

381. He was totally dependent *of* his father: say, dependent *on* his father.

382. They accused him *for* neglecting his duty: say, *of* neglecting &c.

383. They have a great resemblance *with* each other: say, *to* each other.

384. I entirely dissent *with* him; say, *from* him.

385. He was made much *on* at Boston: say, made much *of* &c.

386. He is a man, *on* whom you can confide: say, *in* whom &c.

387. *I'm thinking* he will soon arrive: say, *I think* &c.

388. He was obliged to *fly* the country: say, *flee* the country. A very common mistake.

389. The snuffers *wants* mending: say, *want* mending.



390. His conduct admits of no apology: leave out *of*, which is quite unnecessary.

391. A *gent* has been here, inquiring for you: a detestable, but very common expression: say, a *gentleman* &c.

392. That was *all along of* you: say, That was *all your fault*.

393. You have *no call* to be vexed with me: say, *no occasion* &c.

394. I *don't* know nothing about it: a very common mistake: leave out *don't*.

395. "*Bred and born*," should be, "*Born and bred*."

396. "*If I am not mistaken*," should be, "*If I mistake not*."

397. You *are mistaken*," should be, "*You mistake*."

398. "*I had rather not*," should be, "*I would rather not*."

399. "*I had better go*," should be, "*It were better that I should go*."

400. "*Let you and I*," should be, "*Let you and me*."

401. "*Let them and we*," should be, "*Let them and us*."

402. "*He is a very rising man*," should be, "*He is rising rapidly*."

403. "*Apartments to let*," should be, "*Apartments to be let*."

404. "*No less than ten persons*," should be, "*No fewer than ten persons*."—*Less* must be applied to

quantity, as, "No *less* than ten dollars."—*Fewer* must be applied to persons and things.

405. "I *never* speak *whenever* I can help it," should be, "I never speak *when* I can help it."

406. "*Before* I do that, I must *first* be paid," should be, "Before I do that I must be paid."

407. "To *return back*," should be, "To *return*."

408. "They *retreated back*," should be, "They *retreated*."

409. "To *get over* an illness, should be, "To *survive*," or, "To *recover from* an illness."

410. "To *get over* a person," should be, "To *persuade* a person."

411. "To *get over* a fact," should be, "To *deny*," or "*refute*" it.

412. "The *then* President," should be, "The President *of that day*," or "The *Sixth* President."

413. The *then* Mrs. Madison," should be, "The Mrs. Madison *then living*."

414. "For *ought* I know," should be "For *ought* I know." *Aught* means *anything*; *ought* implies obligation.

415. "As *far as* I know," should be, "So *far as* I know." *As far as* expresses distance.

416. "He *lays* on the sofa," should be, "He *lies* on the sofa."

417. "A *couple* of Dollars," should be "Two dollars,"—Couple means union, as, a married couple.

418. "They *are united together*," should be, "They *are united*."

419. "He speaks *slow*," should be, "He speaks *slowly*."

420. "She is *so much* the lady," should be, "She is very *ladylike*."

421. "He is *noways* in fault." should be "He is *nowise* in fault."

422. "He is *like* to be," should be, "He is *likely* to be."

423. "*All over* the land," should be, "*Over all* the land."

424. "*Whenever* I sing, I *always* am applauded," should be, "*Whenever* I sing, I am applauded."

425. "I am stout in comparison *to* you," should be, "I am stout in comparison *with* you."

426. "*At best*," should be, "*At the best*."

427. "*For to* give," should be, "*To* give."

428. "*At worst's*," should be, "*At the worst*."

429. "The dinner was *all eat up*," should be, "the dinner was *all eaten*."

430. "I *eat* heartily," should be, "I *ate* heartily."

431. "As I *take* it," should be, "As I *see* it," or "*understand* it."

432. "I shall *fall down*," should be, "I shall *fall*."

433. "It *fell on* the floor," should be, "It *fell to* the floor."

434. "He *again repeated* it, should be, "He *repeated* it."

435. "His conduct was *approved of* by all," should be, "His conduct was *approved* by all."

436. "*To enter in*," should be, "*To enter*."

437. "I *enjoy* bad health," should be, "I suffer from illness," or, "I am not in health."

438. "*This* two days," should be, "*These* two days."

439. "Do you *mean* to come?" should be, "Do you *intend* to come?"

440. "*Each* of them *are*," should be, "Each of them *is*." *Each* means one *and* the other of two.

441. "*Either* of the *three*," should be, "*Any* of the three." *Either* means one *or* the other of two.

442. "*Neither* one *or* the other," should be, "Neither one *nor* the other."—*Neither* (not either) means not the one *nor* the other of two.

443. "I am not so rich as *him*," should be, "I am not so rich as *he*."

444. "Better *nor* that," should be, "Better *than* that."

445. "*Bad Grammar*," should be, "Bad or ungrammatical *English*."

446. "Give me *both of them books*," should be, "Give me *both of those books*."

447. "They *both* met," should be, "They *met*."

448. "They conversed *together*," should be, "They *conversed*."

449. "To *lift up*," should be, "To *lift*."

450. "He walked *further* than you," should be, "He walked *farther* than you."—*Farther* must be applied to distance, *further* to quantity, as "Further funds are wanted."

451. "From hence," should be, "Hence,"

452. "From thence," should be, "Thence."

453. "I said so *over again*," should be, "I *repeated* it."

454. "From *here to there*," should be, "From *this place to that*."

455. "No sooner *but*," should be, "No sooner *than*."

456. "No other *but*," should be, "No other *than*."

457. "The balloon *ascended up*," should be, "The balloon *ascended*."

458. The hen is *setting*," should be, "The hen is *sitting*."

459. "*For* you and *I*," should be, "For you and *me*. The same with all prepositions.

460. "A *summer's* morning," should be, "A *summer* morning."

461. "My clothes *have got* too small, or too short for me," should be, "I have become too stout or too tall for my clothes."

462. "It is *equally* the same," should be, "It is the same."

463. "A *most perfect* poem," should be, "A *perfect* poem." Perfect, supreme, complete, brief, full, empty, true, false, do not admit of comparison.

464. Avoid using unmeaning or vulgar phrases in speaking, as, "You don't say so?" "Don't you know?" "Don't you see?" "You know," "You see," "So you see," &c.

465. "Is Mr. Smith *in*?" should be, "Is Mr. Smith *within*?"

466. "The *other one*," should be "The other."

467. "*Another one*," should be, "Another."

468. "Two *spoonsful*," should be, "Two spoon-*fuls*."

469. "*Every* one of them *are*," should be, "Every one of them *is*."—Every refers to any one of a number more than two.



470. "As soon as *ever*," should be, "As soon as."

471. "You will *some* day be sorry," should be, "You will *one* day be sorry."

472. "*Direct* to me," should be, "*Address* to me."

473. "The *very* best," should be, "The best."

474. "The *very* worst," should be, "The worst."

475. "From *now*," should be, "From *this time*."

476. "I differ *with* him," should be, "I differ *from* him."

477. "Therefore, I *thought* it proper to write you," should be, "Therefore I *think* it proper to write *to* you."

478. "I wished *to have written*," should be, "I wished *to write*."

479. "Who is there? Me." The answer should be, "*I*."

480. "Whom do you speak to?" the answer should be, "*Him*."

481. "*There's* thirty," should be, "There are thirty."

482. "The *best* of the *two*," should be, "The *better* of the two."

483. "*More happier*" should be, "Happier," or "More happy."

484. "*Subject matter*," should be, "The subject."

485. "He was killed by a cannon ball," should be, "He was killed *with* a cannon ball."—The gun was fired *by* a man.

486. "Six weeks *back*," should be "Six weeks *ago*, or *since*."

487. "Ten *foot* high," should be, "Ten *feet* high."

488. "*Every now and then,*" should be, "*Often,*" or, "*frequently.*"

489. "Who finds him *in* money?" should be, "Who finds him money?"

490. "The *two first,*" should be, "The *first two.*"

491. "The *two last* should be, "The *last two*"

492. "The *first of all,*" should be, "The *first.*"

493. "The *last of all,*" should be, "The *last.*"

494. "Be that as it *will,*" should be, "Be that as it *may.*"

495. "His health was *drank,*" should be, "His health was *drunk.*"

496. "My *every* hope," should be, "All my *hopes.*"

497. "Since *when,*" should be, "Since *which time.*"

498. "He put it *in* his pocket," should be, "He put it *into* his pocket."

499. "Since *then,*" should be, "Since *that time.*"

500. "He has *got* money," should be, "He *has* money."

501. "Between you and *I,*" should be, "Between you and *me.*"

502. "*Who* should I see?" should be, "*Whom* should I see?"

503. "Seldom *or* ever," should be, "Seldom *if* ever," or "Seldom *or* never."

504. "The *latter* end," should be, "The *end.*"

505. "Will you *set* down," should be, "Will you *sit* down?"

506. "I *set* down?" should be, "I *sat* down."

507. "That *ay'nt* just," should be, "That *is not* just."

508. "I saw it *in here*," should be, "I saw it *here*."

509. "There was a *quantity* of people," should be, "There was a *number* of people."

510. "For *good and all*," should be, "For *ever*."

511. "It is *above* a month since," should be, "It is *more* than a month since."

512. "He is a *superior* man," should be, "He is *superior to most men*."

513. "He lives *at* New York," should be, "He lives *in* New York." At should only be applied to small towns.

514. "To *restore* back," should be, "To *re-store*."

515. "I have *no right* to pay this bill," should be, "I am not *bound* to pay this bill."

516. "Nothing *on it*," should be, "Nothing *of it*."

517. "He *need* not do it," should be, "He *needs* not to do it."

518. "It has *began*," should be, "It has *begun*."

519. "You are older than *me*," should be, "You are older than *I*."

520. "I am taller than *her*," should be, "I am taller than *she*."

521. "I bet you," should be, "I *will*, or I *would* make a bet with you."

522. "I *attackted* him," should be "I *attacked* him."

523 "I am *coming* to your house," should be, "I am going to your house."

524. Nothing is more objectionable than the prefixure of the vowel *a* before words, as they occur

in the following: "I am *a* thinking he won't pay me," or "He is *a* writing to her."

525. How base is the corruption of "his'n" for "his own," and "her'n," for "her own," and "your'n," for "yours" or "your own."

526. "To-morrow *is* Washington's birth day," should be, "To-morrow *will be* Washington's birth day." It is to be supposed that "to-morrow" has not arrived at the time of speaking; hence the incorrectness. The same with "Next Monday *is* the 10th, *ain't it?*" should be, "Monday next will be the 10th, *will it not?*"

527. One great error in pronunciation, is the frequent neglect in sounding the letter g, in words ending with that letter, as in "*Mornin*," "*Morn-ing*." This applies to all words ending "*ing*."

528. "I *throwed* a stone," should be, "I *threw* a stone."

529. "I *suspicioned* him," should be, "I *suspected* him."

530. "I *meant* to have *called* on you," should be, "I *intended calling* on you."

531. "I *seen* her," should be, "I *saw* her."

532. "Go *over* the bridge," should be, "Go *across* the bridge."

533. "Come *here*," should be, "Come *hither*."

534. "I was *some* distance from home," should be, "I was *at* some distance from home."

535. "He lives *opposite* the park," should be, "He lives *opposite to* the park."

536. "I knew him *some* six years ago," should be, "I knew him *six* years ago."

537. "He belongs to the *Mechanics'* Institution," should be, "He is a *member* of the *Mechanics'* Institution."

538. "*Where* do you come *from*?" should be, "*Whence* do you come?"

539. "For *such* another book," should be, "For another *such* book."

540. "They *mutually* loved each *other*," should be, "They loved *each other*."

541. "I *ay'nt*," should be, "I *am not*."

542. "I am *up to you*," should be, "I *understand* you."



## 22.—RHETORICAL COMPOSITION.

RHETORIC and oratory have the same meaning they signify the art of speaking well upon a subject in order to persuade. Rhetoric is an art comprised in certain rules, which are adapted to render speaking successful in accomplishing its purposes.

The first thing to be observed by an orator is to speak with truth and propriety; the second is to adopt due method in the arrangement of his arguments; the third is the embellishment of his subject with the beauties of language; and the fourth is the degree of copiousness which shall fully express what is best suited to his purpose.

Oratory is comprised in four divisions, viz.: Invention, Disposition, Elocution, and Pronunciation.

*Invention* is the discovery of such arguments as are adapted to prove or illustrate the subject; to conciliate the favor and engage the passions of an audience.

An argument is that which presents reasons to convince the mind, and induce belief of what was before doubted or disbelieved. Thus, if the purpose of a speaker is to prove temperance to be beneficial to men, the proper mode is to show its good effects on health and economy; for if it promotes these it is a personal benefit, as all men will admit that health and economy are beneficial. Or, we may prove the same point by contrasting the effects of temperance with those of intemperance, and show-

ing that intemperance impairs health and wastes property, which are evil effects. In all cases of reasoning, we are to proceed on known facts, or on principles which are admitted or undeniable, such as the laws of nature; mathematical principles; or on events which are known; or we are to proceed on probabilities, in which case the strength of arguments and their tendency to convince, will depend on the strength of the evidence; or, we are to proceed on testimony, which is the declaration of witnesses. In the latter case, we are to consider the number and character of the witnesses, the nature of their testimony, and the various circumstances which may increase or lessen their credibility.

In reasoning on the established laws of nature, as in mathematics, if the process is correct the result is certain. But in reasoning on probabilities or human testimony we may be deceived or misled, and by this means we may arrive at a wrong conclusion. Hence it sometimes happens that men addicted to mathematical reasoning, are apt to be led to false conclusions, when they reason on the interest, motives and passions of men, or on the ordinary occurrences of life.

In all our reasonings it is important to have clear ideas of the subject, and to use words of definite signification. All ambiguous words, which admit of two or more senses, should be carefully avoided. In every step of reasoning, the statements should be clear and precise, and every point fully established.

*Disposition.*—Disposition is the manner of ar-

ranging the materials of a discourse. This should be so methodical that every part should succeed that on which it depends for support; or, it should be the order in which arguments follow each other in a train of reasoning. Young clergymen and pleaders at the bar, and indeed all persons whose pursuits call for a thorough knowledge of the *art* of oratory, will find the following arrangement of the parts of a discourse to be both lucid and effective. In politics, this arrangement counts among its followers such men as Sheridan, Pitt, Fox, Brougham, Patrick Henry, Alexander Hamilton, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Charles Sumner; in law, Francis North, Lord Bacon, Wm. C. Preston, Lewis Cass, Wm. H. Seward, Rufus Choate, Millard Fillmore, Levi Woodbury; in divinity, John Knox, Hugh Blair, Thomas Chalmers, Jonathan Edwards, John M. Mason, Stephen Olin, John Summerfield, Henry Ward Beecher, Stephen H. Tyng, Gardiner Spring. It is termed the Ciceronian arrangement, and is comprised of six parts, which are as follows: 1. *Introduction*; 2. *Narration*; 3. *Proposition*; 4. *Confirmation*; 5. *Confutation*; 6. *Conclusion*.

The *introduction* is designed to prepare the minds of hearers for a suitable reception of the parts which are to follow. It should also give some general account of the subject of the discourse. A general view of the subject proposed, and of its design, enables the hearer the better to connect and understand the several parts as they succeed each other.

*Narration* is the recital of something done, in the

order and manner in which it was done; such as the cause, manner, time, place, and consequences of an action or event, with the character and circumstances of the persons concerned. This part of a discourse is often necessary, to render it more intelligible to the hearers. The narration should be as brief as the questions contained in the discourse will admit; whatever is necessary to elucidate the subject should be stated; but all matter foreign to the subject should be omitted. All the statements should be perspicuous, probable, and as entertaining as the subject will admit.

The *proposition* of a regular discourse is a clear, distinct statement of the subject, and the main points to be proved. In this part of an oration or discourse, it is often necessary to divide the subject into distinct heads; each of which is to be separately considered. This division often assists the hearer to understand and recollect the several points stated, and the arguments applicable to each.

*Confirmation.*—Confirmation is that part of a discourse which furnishes proof, authority, and support to a cause. This includes the arguments, the evidence, and the reasoning, which are intended to sustain the cause. In this part, the reasoning may often be conducted by syllogisms. Thus, to demonstrate that the world is under the direction of a wise governor, we may reason thus: ‘Things which are directed by wisdom are better governed than those which are not. Nothing can be better governed than the Solar system. Hence we infer

that the Solar system is under the direction of a wise governor." This is the synthetic mode of reasoning.

The analytic method of reasoning is different. In this, the speaker proceeds step by step till he brings his hearers to the intended conclusion. Thus, for example, to prove the being of a God, or Intelligent Author of all things, he may reason thus: "Everything we see in the world had a beginning; whatever had a beginning must have had a prior cause, for it is clear that no effect exists without a cause; hence we infer that the world and all that we see of creation, must have had a supreme cause. From the order and harmony of the universe, we further infer that the Supreme Cause is an intelligent and wise Being, as order cannot proceed from accident or ignorance."

Instead of a complete syllogism, orators often use an *enthymeme*, which is an imperfect syllogism, consisting of two parts, one of the premises of a complete syllogism, and the conclusion. For example: "Our duty requires that we should love what is most excellent. Therefore, duty requires that we should love God." Here the second or minor proposition is omitted, as being too obvious to need recital. It would read thus: "God is most excellent. Therefore it is our duty to love Him."

*Confutation* is the disproving of the reasoning of an opposite party. This is done by arguments and reasoning, as in the other cases, or by contradiction. Contradiction, however, cannot avail, unless when facts are too obvious to be denied. Sometimes an ad-



versary may be confuted by directing his own reasoning against himself; sometimes by turning against him what he has admitted; and sometimes by finding and presenting to view a defect in reasoning. In some cases, an orator may admit an adversary's argument, but deny its validity or its application to the question.

The *conclusion* of a discourse may consist of two parts, namely: *recapitulation*, and an *address* to the passions of the hearers. Recapitulation is a summary of all the material arguments in a discourse, intended to refresh the memory, and, by bringing them into a narrow compass, present them in a stronger light. Such a summary, well-conducted, has often a very impressive effect. In addressing the passions, the orator must direct his efforts to excite such feelings as will operate in favor of his arguments.

The conclusion of Mr. Ames's speech in Congress, on the treaty of peace with Great Britain, affords a fine example of an address to the sympathy of his hearers. He was in feeble health, and after a most brilliant display of eloquence, he closed with the following words: "I have, perhaps, as little personal interest in the event as any one here. There is, I believe, no member who will not think his chance to be a witness of the consequences greater than mine. If, however, the vote should pass to reject the treaty, and a spirit should rise, as it will, with the public disorders, to make confusion worse confounded, even I, slender and almost broken as my hold upon life is, may outlive the government and constitution of my country."

### 23.—COMPOSITION FOR THE PRESS.

DAILY and weekly newspapers are termed *The Press*; the editors of these are called *members* of the press. In every well-regulated daily newspaper office each department has one or more editors, some of whom are styled reporters. The usual departments are as follows, namely: The political; commercial; agricultural; literary; home; foreign; financial; shipping; city news; police; theatrical; musical; law; general news. Those having charge of the shipping, city news, police, and law departments, are commonly termed *reporters*. In addition to these, there are usually market, hotel, and other reporters. The editor of the political department is called the political editor of the paper; the editor of the literary or review department, the literary editor, &c., &c.

In preparing matter for the daily press, the following points should be carefully borne in mind, namely: 1. Precision of subject; 2. Precision of thought; 3. Precision of expression. To these must be added, 1. Brevity; 2. Brevity; 3. Brevity. A due observance of these points will eventually lead to marked proficiency, and enable the writer to command a respectable position in journalism.

A person desirous of becoming a newspaper writer should select some particular line. General writers, like general actors, rarely attain to competence or

fame. The reason is obvious. Though they may be passable in all departments, they are remarkable in none. The path to eminence and wealth is through *specialities*. Placide, the actor, never attracted attention till he devoted himself exclusively to the impersonation of old men; Power succeeded only when he relinquished general parts, and confined his personations to those of Irishmen. Douglas Jerrold could scarcely earn a living as a miscellaneous writer; but on turning his attention to satire, his pen was kept constantly employed. Cooper's fame suffered when he turned aside from forest to social life. Bryant as a poet is deservedly eminent; but Bryant as a political and miscellaneous editor attracts no notice. Horace Greeley as a general writer could not earn the wages of a journeyman printer; Horace Greeley as a political writer has risen to fame and fortune. James Gordon Bennett, when a miscellaneous writer, was often thankful for an invitation to a dinner; James Gordon Bennett's reputation as a newspaper engineer is world-wide. Bird, the novelist, sunk into obscurity when he became an editor. Mr. W. Gilmore Simms has won a certain degree of reputation, by confining his literary efforts mainly to tales of the Revolution. Lardner, by adhering to science, has acquired a name and profit. Wilson, as a miscellaneous writer, promised to find his way into what he did not seek—oblivion; as "Christopher North," critic, his fame is universal. An energetic persistence in a certain course sooner or later leads to success. The reward of that success depends upon

the profit of such course. There are courses in literature that yield neither fame nor money ; and all who labor in them glean nothing. There are others that yield both, in proportion to the energy and industry with which the latter are sought. But it should be always remembered by the struggler that fame and profit are the reward, not of a single bold effort, but of an extended series of triumphs. Had Dickens failed to follow up his "Pickwick Papers," his would have been only a temporary fame ; but having followed it with a series of equally superior productions, his reputation will live for centuries.

A person desirous of entering into journalism should carefully educate himself, by private practice, for some special department in the same. He should accustom himself to ready thought, ready decision, and ready expression. This can be attained, but only after long and patient practice. Each of his private attempts should be written with as much care as if it were designed for immediate publication in a journal whose readers are all critics. This course may be objected to, as calling for the exercise of too great patience, application, and study ; but it should be remembered that, in this age of abundant talent, eminence in any one literary department is to be won only by unusual effort. He who is unwilling to make such effort will find literature a thorny path. In this, as in every profession, the struggler must look to find hosts of able and energetic competitors, of established fame and position, in every department, each and all of whom are ready to contest with him inch by inch of the road to superior-

ity. But let him not be disheartened. Many of these men are not true to themselves. Dissipation, negligence, unwillingness to manfully face the severe demands of their profession, and numerous other causes, are constantly thinning their number, and making room for others. Let the struggler's motto be, "Press on!" Rivals give way, in time, to competitors more determined than themselves. Of a hundred runners in a race, only a few hold out to the end. Perseverance oftener wins than loses.

The above remarks apply with equal force to writers in every department of literature. If a literary aspirant desires to become a novelist, a romancist, a poet, a historian, a lexicographer, an essayist, a memoirist; a literary, dramatic, musical, or other critic; a paragraphist; a political, commercial, agricultural, scientific, or other writer, let him not damage his proficiency in that line, if he have any, by writing anything else, even for amusement; let him qualify himself for his chosen speciality alone. Any departure, no matter how trifling, from his accustomed train of thought and expression, takes him into another, and he loses just so much of the command which he had acquired over the first as he has obtained in the second; and a return to his original individuality is attended with considerable difficulty and loss of time and temper. Independently of this, a writer should so far venerate the dignity of his profession as never to write upon any topic with which he is not legitimately familiar. A due observance of this rule will enable every literary man to do himself and his brethren justice; and also



entitle him to an honorable position in his profession. Writers who disregard this rule generally pay the penalty of its non-observance by the interruption which it rarely fails to make to their progress. Writers who complacently assert that they can turn from one line to another without mental disturbance or inconvenience, are mainly persons of little or no reputation. A brilliant paragraphist is seldom or ever readable as a tale writer; and after writing a tale, his next few paragraphs are generally wanting in brilliancy. A commercial writer may try his pen at a poem; but if he does, the chances are that his poem would make him the laughing-stock of his friends. N. P. Willis is a poet of surpassing excellence; but fancy him sitting down to write an article on commerce!

## POLITICAL "EDITORIALS."

THE following will serve to convey to the mind of the reader, better than any description, an idea of a vigorous political "editorial." The style is somewhat impudent, opinionative, and extravagant, but it may be regarded as a fair sample of popular newspaper writing :

### THE WAR FEVER—CRAMPTON'S RECALL

England and the United States are the only two great nations of the earth in which the people are theoretically the ruling powers, and where the popular will may impress itself directly upon the genius of Government. And the people of these two great nations, the foremost of all the earth in wealth, intelligence and power, live in terms of the closest intimacy that is possible with two distinct nations. They speak the same language, read each other's books, intermarry, exchange products, borrow and lend, and trust each other to sums almost beyond computation. They visit each other continually, believe in each other, and, in all the relations of human beings, cultivate as close an intimacy as two people can. At the very thought of war they hold up their hands in horror ; they recoil from the possibility of shedding each other's blood, and of rending the bonds which have been so firmly riveted and under which they have prospered so long, grown so mighty, and been so happy. War, to such people, so closely allied, and having so many interests in common, must cause unmitigated confusion and suffering. They have no desire to humiliate each other ; they know too well each other's strength to have any desire to put it to the test of an actual conflict : and, if let alone and permitted to have their own way, there never would be war between them. But the people of these two countries do not, in fact, hold their destinies in their own hands ; the men who are intrusted for a time with the direction of the machinery of Government are the real rulers, and by their bungling, their imbecility, their carelessness, or their personal ambition, they may precipitate the two nations into a bloody and demoralizing contest, sorely against the wishes of the people themselves.

An irresolute and rash Executive on the one side, and a bungling incompetent Ambassador on the other, whose proclivity to mistakes is marvellous even in one of his trade, have very nearly brought the two people into a position where war may be unavoidable. Were it not for

the absurdity of the supposition that two nations like England and the United States should engage in a bloody conflict, to establish no principle, to avenge no wrongs, to secure no great rights, and without the existence of any ill feelings even, on either side, merely because a bungling diplomatic agent had made a mistake, or misunderstood the terms of a treaty, there might be reasons for apprehending a suspension of friendly relations between the two countries.

By our special telegraphic dispatch from Washington, it appears that the *Asia*, which arrived yesterday, brought the long anticipated reply from the British Government refusing to recall Mr. CRAMPTON. Of course, this leaves no choice for our own Government but to dismiss him; for it is not to be supposed that a Minister will be allowed to remain at his post, who is so objectionable that his recall has been demanded. There is a crisis at hand; and if it shall lead to the substitution of an English minister at Washington, in the place of Mr. CRAMPTON, who will be less liable to mistakes than that gentleman, we shall have quieter times hereafter. Gen. WALKER's Government recognized, and Mr. CRAMPTON dismissed, we may well ask "what next?" and not be obliged to wait long for an answer.

The annexed is in the same style, and it will be found worthy of examination by the student. The key to its pungency will be found in the writer's free use of expletives.

#### THE PALMERSTON MINISTRY

As we anticipated, the English Parliament has scouted, by a larger majority than has marked a party division since the days of PITT, the motion on the fall of Kars of the Irish orator Mr. WHITESIDE, who, like many Irish orators of a particular class, would appear to be a mere prurient wind-bag, "all sound and fury, signifying nothing." It was generally felt that the motion was undertaken, not from any real conviction of its justice, but merely as a move to put PALMERSTON out and the Derby-Disraelites in, which is the ruling principle of Mr. DISRAELI's policy. Probably not half the men who voted, including the mover himself, until crammed for the occasion, knew where Kars was, or would sacrifice to its salvation one hour of the Treasury bench. Lord PALMERSTON was, therefore, sustained, not alone by his own immediate party, and the Peelites and the Manchester school, who hold the balance, but by a large section of the more respectable of the Tory Party, who consider that the Premier has sustained the honor of England, and will not sacrifice to the adventitious tactics of party the permanent interests of the State. So the petard burst harmlessly, or at least only hoisted those who had given it the start. Many of the more hungry followers of Lord DERBY are doubtless weary of wandering in the political wilderness, and are perishing for the manna of office, but there are

many of the fine old Englishmen who care little who is in, so that the glory of England is maintained. Lord DERBY, too, when last sent for, was unable to lay, not alone a dainty dish, but any dish at all, before the Queen. And he has not since acquired any additional materials. Why then put PALMERSTON out?

The following is the usual form of an editorial:

#### SUMMARY OF FOREIGN NEWS.

The Royal Mail steamship *Asia*, Capt. LOTT, from Liverpool, arrived at her dock early yesterday morning. The news is three days later than that received by the *Atlantic*, but presents no feature of importance.

The official report of the proceedings of the Peace Congress had been published, but are little more than a reproduction of the treaty and protocols already made known.

It appears that the advance copy of the treaty of peace, which eventually appeared in the London *Daily News*, was hawked about among the London press, but not one of those "enterprising" papers would pay for it the price demanded—1,000 francs, about \$200!

A letter from Berlin in the *Bourse Gazette* of Vienna says: "The proposal made by England to capitalize the Sound Dues, and to extinguish the capital by gradual payments, will not be accepted by Denmark, which has addressed a circular to that effect to its agents at the foreign courts interested in the question. The States bordering on the Baltic have not yet replied to the proposal of England. The negotiations which had commenced at Copenhagen, and were interrupted in March last, will probably be resumed."

A telegraphic dispatch from Copenhagen, of the 27th inst., states that by an unexpected turn the exclusive Danish party presente, in the sitting of the General Diet on the 26th, by its organ, Bishop MOURAD, a proposition tending to revise the common constitution throughout.

The stations to which French Consuls or Consular Agents will be sent, in the Black Sea, are said to be Kertch, Cherson, Baktchissarai, or Simpheropol, Nicolaieff, and Taganrog, with, as before, a Consul at Odessa.

The *Press d'Orient* announces that the majority of the inhabitants of Eupatoria are emigrating through fear of being compromised; and similar movements are taking place in Abasia and in Mingrelie.

By intelligence from Constantinople under date of 21st, it would appear that discontent prevailed on account of the quarantine of forty days imposed on vessels arriving from the Russian ports of the Black Sea.

Baron BRUNOW, who was for many years ambassador to England, where he was socially very popular, had arrived in London, and a general hope is entertained that he will be permitted to resume his old post, which he vacated on the breaking out of the war.

Mr. R. M. Fox and Mr. BLACKETT, both members of the British Parlia

ment, are dead. The one was member for Longford in Ireland, the other for Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT, M. P., has again relapsed, and it is now certain that a long period of repose will be needed before he is able to appear in Parliament again. This is pleasant for PALMERSTON, whose bitter foe he was. Mr. BRIGHT is at Malvern, trying the cold-water cure.

On last Sunday week, a day of general thanksgiving was observed in England. The illuminations come off on the Queen's birthday.

*Paragraphing* is the most difficult of all newspaper writing. To do it well, requires decided talent and continual practice. The mere writing, even though a labor of love, is still a labor which sooner or later deprives the mind of its elasticity, and reduces it to mental servitude. From that moment, paragraphing degenerates into exhausting drudgery. Paragraphists are the shortest-lived of all the representatives of the press. The following bear the impress of comparatively fresh pens :

CENTRAL PARK LANDS.—The measures taken in reference to the opening of Central Park, have produced quite a commotion among property-holders within the proposed limits. Some complain that the awards made them are not equal to what in justice they are entitled ; but most of them, doubtless, could truly say that the sums named fall short of their expectations. There being an uncertainty as to the actual period when the work of "laying out" will commence, and in order to secure to the city all the revenue available from this source, the various tenements and lands on the new Park grounds, have been rented as far as practicable, and on the best possible terms, for the period of one year, from the first of the present month ; the Corporation reserving the right to enter upon possession of the premises, on giving ninety days' notice. A large number of these houses are now empty, the former occupants having preferred to move at once, than run the risk of being ousted before the end of the year. The present number of tenants, is about 180, and the general quality of the houses, and the present productiveness of the land in that section, may be inferred from the fact, that more than 130 pay a rent not exceeding \$40 per year, and a good many not more than \$10. The amount received for the first quarter of the year is some \$1,800. It is probable the work of opening the Central Park will be commenced during the season in good earnest, and the reign of squatter sovereignty in that locality will therefore have a speedy end.



EFFECTS OF DISREGARDING THE MAINE LAW.—Capt. Hodgkins, of the canal boat *Europa*, at Poplar street wharf, went on board about 2 A.M. on Wednesday morning, in a state of intoxication, and after setting the cabin on fire in his obliviousness, returned on deck and went to sleep. The fire spread, and horrible to relate, burned to death his little son and a negro, who were asleep in the cabin; and when he was awakened by the police, stumbled, fell overboard, and came near being drowned:

“Oh thou invisible spirit of wine,  
Hadst thou no other name to be known by,  
Let us call thee—devil!”

THE WEATHER AND THE ANNIVERSARIES.—The anniversaries are over. Our streets once more begin to assume their natural aspect, and profane people do not hesitate to assert that we may now hope to enjoy an agreeable season. Certainly we need it. It has been the staple of many an honest prayer for some days. Such incessant rain as we had all last week was monotonous enough—to speak it mildly as possible; though what the exodus of the anniversary folks had to do with the pleasant change that greeted us on Sunday, or why the two ideas should be so associated in the general imagination, we cannot see. Why the weather should be expected to clear up, when *they* clear out, is not so clear to us; but as there is always some occult shadow of reason in all these popular notions, we yield up gracefully our distrust, and stand ready to praise the sunshine the moment that we feel sure it has become permanent.

A FLATTERING OFFER.—We see that Dr. Kane has declined Lady Franklin's renewed offer to take the command of an expedition about to be sent out by her, with the assistance of the British Government, to find, if possible, the remains of Sir John Franklin, and the relics of his ships. The offer was a most flattering one for our distinguished countryman, every inducement being proposed that could have tempted him to accept it; but he finally declined it, as we see it stated, from entire inability to get his previous engagements off his hands so as to be ready in season to set sail. The new expedition is to consist of a steamer; and as the district in which Sir John Franklin's party are now known to have perished does not exceed some hundred and fifty miles in diameter, the search may be performed with comparative rapidity and freedom from danger. It is certainly a high compliment that the command of a British expedition of the kind should be offered to an American.

The following shows a long-practiced pen, somewhat blunted by severe labor:

ACCIDENT TO THE “KEYSTONE STATE.”—On Monday morning, about one o'clock, the steamship *Keystone State*, from Savannah for Philadelphia,

came in collision with the bark *Cavalier*, from Baltimore bound to Rio. The bow of the steamship was stove in, and she commenced making water rapidly. She was soon freed from the leak, and made for Norfolk, where she has arrived, and been run on the flats to keep her from sinking. At the time of the collision the first and second mates and three sailors belonging to the bark got on the steamer. The bark was struck opposite the foremast and crushed so as to prevent her from reaching a port. The captain called for help, and said his vessel was sinking, but the officers of the steamer were not willing to risk the safety of their passengers in endeavoring to succor him. The steamship had a most narrow escape. At one time the water had gained so much as to be within three inches of her fires. Most of the passengers of the *Keystone State* arrived at Baltimore this morning in the boat from Norfolk.

The next step in the descending scale, is the composition of dry facts. This kind of paragraphing is technically called hack-writing, since it bears no evidence of mind, and is the last work of a worn-out brain. Annexed are three specimens :

QUICK PASSAGE.—The ship *Tuscarora*, Capt. Dunlevy, sailed from Philadelphia for Liverpool, March 23, remained in Liverpool fifteen days, and arrived back at Philadelphia May 26, in twenty-eight days, making the voyage out and home, including her stay at Liverpool, in sixty-one days.

MEETING OF THE NEW ENGLAND BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.—At a meeting of the New England American Branch Tract Society yesterday, after an earnest and interesting discussion, the Rev. A. L. Stone was elected on the Executive Committee in place of the Rev. Nehemiah Adams, author of the *South Side View of Slavery*. Mr. Stone received fifty-six votes, and Mr. Adams forty-three. The opposition to his reelection was that New England should not be represented in a National Society by a person holding the views of slavery attributed to Dr. Adams.

FILLMORE AND DONALDSON CENTRAL CLUB.—A meeting was held last evening at Military Hall, No. 193 Bowery, composed of delegates from nine Fillmore Clubs in the different wards, with the design of forming a Central Club. Dr. John Wetheral, of the Seventh Ward, presided. In consequence of the small number of clubs represented, it was finally decided to call a future meeting to perfect an organization. A Committee of five was named to meet at Merritt's Hall this evening, to make arrangements for the reception of Mr. Fillmore.

## FORMS OF LITERARY REVIEWS.

NEWSPAPER criticisms are necessarily brief. We append the forms now most in vogue. The first two are upon original publications; the third upon a new edition of an old work :

"MARRIED, NOT MATED. *By Alice Cary.*—This is by far the best book that Miss Cary has yet published, and it affords us pleasure to praise it. In our capacity as critics, we have several times had occasion to notice the lady, sometimes a little severely, for what we consider her chief fault—the melancholy monotony of her writings. We have nothing of the sort to harp at in "Married, not Mated." Bating the moral of the story, which is implied rather than distinctly stated, it is a pleasant, and in many respects, a merry book. It is impossible to read some chapters without laughing heartily. Miss Cary has a rich vein of quiet humor, which shows itself in the creation of two really comic characters, characters of which any modern novelist might well be proud—Rache, an impudent free and easy American domestic, and Uncle Peter, or as his cards have it, Mr. Samuel P. J. T. Throckmorton, a second edition of Pecksniff, with original variations. Both are excellently drawn. The rest of the personages are nicely discriminated; even the faintest linger in the mind, like the remembrances of actual men and women. We shall not tell you the story, but send you to the book itself for it."

"THE HEROES; OR, GREEK FAIRY TALES FOR MY CHILDREN. *By the Rev. C. Kingsley.*—Perseus, the Argonauts, and Theseus, are the subjects here selected by Mr. Kingsley, and woven by him into three separate stories. His preface invites his children to gather examples of courage and endurance from these antique legends, and reminds them how much we are ourselves beholden to Greece, for the rudiments of Science and the perfection of some branches of Art. Nothing could be more felicitous than the style and language employed. In simplicity they are adapted to the youngest child; and yet they rise at times almost into classic stateliness. Our author, so widely recognized as a man of strong sense and fine imagination, here also makes his début as an artist. But, Shade of Apelles what a début it is. The woodcutting is so bad, that the classical tumbles down into the comical. Notwithstanding this—from the third illustration alone—we would venture to declare that the original designs were clever."

"ANCIENT SPANISH BALLADS. *Translated by J. G. Lockhart.*—A new and very neat edition of a work that is entirely independent of criticism :

it passed through the ordeal long ago, and became at once an unquestioned favorite. Who, indeed, maiden or youth, gifted with a spark of love or romance or poetry, is unfamiliar with the false Andalla, and has not sung or repeated the stirring adjuration,

Rise up, rise up, Xarifa! lay the golden cushion down;  
Rise up, come to the window, and gaze with all the town!

Very, very rarely has a translator reproduced so much of the grace and spirit of his originals. The youthful generation are to be envied, who first make acquaintance, through these flowing strains, with the chivalric days of Spain. The value of this welcome duodecimo is increased by the republication therein of a noble tribute to the memory of Lockhart, that appeared in the London *Times*, on the occasion of his death, in December, 1854."

Another form, and somewhat less critical than the above, will be found in the following, which may be regarded as fair specimens of the literary "notices" which have of late years so generally taken the place of criticism:

"With pleasure we acknowledge the receipt of 'A MEMOIR OF THE REV. LEIGH RICHMOND, A.M.,' a man to whom many, very many, owe the light which has shown them the way to salvation. To his little tract of 'The Dairyman's Daughter' alone, thousands have traced their conversion and eternal happiness. The memoir is by the Rev. T. S. Grimshaw, A.M., an English divine, and is reprinted by the Protestant Episcopal Society of New York, from the twelfth London Edition. It has long been scarce and difficult to procure, and every one should possess himself of one of these neat copies, in view of such scarcity again."

"Another most valuable book we find in 'A KEY TO THE BIBLE,' by David Dobbie. It consists of 'an exposition of the history, axioms and general laws of sacred interpretation,' and seems fully to meet the serious wants of those who are desirous of studying the 'Sacred Scriptures,' and who cannot always have access to some grave theologian to explain dark passages and reason away doubts."

"Miss A. A. Goddard has gathered together her mental offspring in an interesting family circle, which she calls 'GLEANINGS: SOME WHEAT, SOME CHAFF.' Having no wish to be classed among the 'unsympathizing critics,' whose 'rough growlings' she deprecates, we will simply open the door of the great world to her little family, whom she seems perfectly willing to trust to the ordeal."

CONCLUSION.—The author of these pages thinks he need say no more to show the necessity for such a work as the present—a work which he feels much pleasure in now submitting to the notice of a candid and discriminating public.

To the learned and enlightened members of the Scholastic Profession, the author would respectfully suggest that his little volume might, perhaps, be advantageously placed in the hands of the youth intrusted to their care.





Liberty or Slavery; the Great National Question.

---

THREE PRIZE ESSAYS

ON

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

---

"THE TRUTH IN LOVE."

---

BOSTON :  
CONGREGATIONAL BOARD OF PUBLICATION.  
1857.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1857, by  
SEWALL HARDING,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

CAMBRIDGE :  
ALLEN AND FARNHAM, STEREOTYPERS AND PRINTERS.

## PREMIUM OFFERED.

A BENEVOLENT individual, who has numerous friends and acquaintances both North and South, and who has had peculiar opportunities for learning the state and condition of all sections of the nation, perceiving the danger of our national Institutions, and deeply impressed with a sense of the importance, in this time of peril, of harmonizing Christian men through the country, by kind yet faithful exhibitions of truth on the subject now agitating the whole community, offered a premium of \$100 for the best Essay on the subject of Slavery, fitted to influence the great body of Christians through the land.

The call was soon responded to by nearly fifty writers, whose manuscripts were examined by the distinguished committee appointed by the Donor, whose award has been made, as their certificate, here annexed, will show.

---

## PREMIUM AWARDED.

THE undersigned, appointed a Committee to award a premium of one hundred dollars, offered by a benevolent individual, for the best Essay on the subject of Slavery, “ adapted

to receive the approbation of Evangelical Christians generally," have had under examination more than forty competing manuscripts, a large number of them written with much ability. They have decided to award the prize to the author of the Essay entitled, "*The Error and the Duty in regard to Slavery*," whom they find, on opening the accompanying envelope, to be the Rev. R. B. THURSTON, of Chicopee Falls, Mass.

They would also commend to the attention of the public, two of the remaining tracts, selected by the individual who offered the prize, and for which he and others interested have given a prize of one hundred dollars each. One of these is entitled, "*Friendly Letters to a Christian Slaveholder*," by Rev. A. C. BALDWIN, of Durham, Conn.; the other, "*Is American Slavery an Institution which Christianity sanctions and will perpetuate?*" by Rev. TIMOTHY WILLISTON, of Strongsville, Ohio.

ASA D. SMITH,

MARK HOPKINS,

THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN.

May, 1857.



## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
I. THE ERROR AND THE DUTY IN REGARD TO SLAVERY,	1
II. FRIENDLY LETTERS TO A CHRISTIAN SLAVE-HOLDER,	39
III. IS AMERICAN SLAVERY AN INSTITUTION WHICH CHRISTIANITY SANCTIONS AND WILL PERPET- UATE, . . . * . . . . .	99

THE ERROR AND THE DUTY

IN

REGARD TO SLAVERY.

BY

REV. R. B. THURSTON.

(vii)

# THE ERROR AND THE DUTY

## IN REGARD TO SLAVERY.

---

THE great and agitating question of our country is that concerning slavery. Beneath the whole subject there lies of course some simple truth, for all fundamental truth is simple, which will be readily accepted by patriotic and Christian minds, when it is clearly perceived and discreetly applied. It is the design of these pages to exhibit this truth, and to show that it is a foundation for a union of sentiment and action on the part of good men, by which, under the divine blessing, our threatening controversies, North and South, may be happily terminated.

To avoid misapprehension, let it be noticed that we shall examine the central claim of slavery, first, as a legal institution; afterwards, the

moral relations of individuals connected with it will be considered. In that examination the term *property, as possessed in men*, will be used in the specific sense which is given to it by the slave laws and the practical operation of the system. No other sense is relevant to the discussion. The property of the father in the services of the son, of the master in the labor of the apprentice, of the State in the forced toil of the convict, is not in question. None of these relations creates slavery as such; and they should not be allowed, as has sometimes been done, to obscure the argument.

The limits of a brief tract on a great subject compel us to pass unnoticed many questions which will occur to a thoughtful mind. It is believed that they all find their solution in our fundamental positions; and that all passages of the Bible relating to the general subject, when faithfully interpreted in their real harmony, sustain these positions. It is admitted that the following argument is unsound if it does not provide for every logical and practical exigency.

The primary truth which is now to be established may be thus stated: *All men are invested by the Creator with a common right to hold property in inferior things; but they have no such right to hold property in men.*

Christians agree that God as the Creator is the original proprietor of all things, and that he has absolute right to dispose of all things according to his pleasure. This right he never relinquishes, but asserts in his word and exercises in his providence. The Bible speaks thus: "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein, for he hath founded it. We are his people and the sheep of his pasture" — ourselves, therefore, subject to his possession and disposal as the feeble flock to us. Even irreligious men often testify to this truth, confessing the hand of providence in natural events that despoil them of their wealth.

Now, under his own supreme control, God has *given* to all men equally a dependent and limited right of property. *Given* is the word repeatedly chosen by inspiration in this connection. "The heavens are the Lord's, but the earth hath he *given* to the children of men." In Eden he blessed the first human pair, and said to them, in behalf of the race, "Replenish the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. Behold, I have *given* you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which is the



fruit of a tree yielding seed." This, then, is the original and permanent ground of man's title to property; and the important fact to be observed is the *specific divine grant*. The right of all men equally to own property is the positive institution of the Creator. We all alike hold our possessions by his authentic warrant, his deed of conveyance.

Let us be understood here. We are not educating from the Bible a doctrine which would level society, by giving to all men equal shares of property; but a doctrine which extends equal divine protection over the right of every man to hold that amount of property which he earns by his own faculties, in consistency with all divine statutes.

This right is indeed argued from nature; and justly; for God's revelations in nature and in his word coincide. It is, however, a right of so much consequence to the world, that, where nature leaves it, he incorporates it, and gives it the force of a law; so that in the sequel we can with propriety speak of it as a law, as well as an institution. To the believer in the Bible, this law is the end of argument.

It will have weight with some minds to state that this position is supported by the highest legal authority. In his Commentaries on the

Laws of England, Blackstone quotes the primeval grant of God, and then remarks, "This is the only true and solid foundation of man's dominion over external things, whatever airy metaphysical notions may have been started by fanciful writers upon this subject. The earth, therefore, and all things therein, are the general property of all mankind, exclusive of other beings, from the immediate gift of the Creator." \*

It will enhance the force of this argument to remember that this universal right of property is one of what may be called a sacred trinity of paradisaical institutions. These institutions are the Sabbath, appointed in regard for our relations to God as moral beings; marriage, ordained for our welfare as members of a successive race; and the right of property, conferred to meet our necessities as dwellers on this material globe. These three are the world's inheritance from lost Eden. They were received by the first father in behalf of all his posterity. They were designed for all men as men. It is demonstrable that they are indispensable, that the world may become Paradise Regained. "Property, marriage, and religion have been called the pillars of soci-

\* An extended passage containing the extract may be found conveniently in Chambers' Cyclopædia of English Literature, vol. 2, p. 246.

ety;" and the first is of equal importance with the other two; for all progress in domestic felicity and in religious culture depends on property, and also on the equitable distribution or possession of property, as one of its essential conditions. Property lies in the foundation of every happy home, however humble; and property gilds the pinnacle of every consecrated temple. The wise and impartial Disposer, therefore, makes the endowments of his creatures equal with their responsibilities: to all those on whom he lays the obligations of religion and of the family state, he gives the right of holding the property on which the dwelling and the sanctuary must be founded. It is a sacred right, a divine investiture, bearing the date of the creation and the seal of the Creator.

The blessing of this institution, like that of the Sabbath and of the family, has indeed been shattered by the fall of man; but when God said to Noah and his sons, concerning the inferior creatures, "Into your hand are they delivered; even as the green herb have I given you all things," it was reëstablished and consecrated anew. The Psalmist repeated the assurance to the world when he wrote, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hand; thou hast put all things under his feet."

We now advance to the second part of our proposition. Men have no such right to hold property in men. Since the right is from God, it follows immediately that they can hold in ownership, by a divine title, only what he has given. But he has not given to men, as men, a right of ownership in men. No one will contend for a moment that the universal grant above, considered confers upon them mutual dominion, or rightful property in their species. The idea is not in the terms; it is nowhere in the Bible; it is not in nature; it is repugnant to common sense; it would resolve the race into the absurd and terrific relation of antagonists, struggling, each one for the mastery of his own estate in another,—I, for the possession of my right in you; and you, for yours in me. Nay, the very act of entitling all men to hold property proves the exemption of all, by the divine will, from the condition of property. The idea that a man can be an article of property and an owner of property by the same supreme warrant is contradictory and absurd.

We now have sure ground for objecting to the system of American slavery, as such. It is directly opposed to the original, authoritative institution of Jehovah. He gives men the right to hold property. Slavery strips them of the divine

investiture. He gives men dominion over inferior creatures. Slavery makes them share the subjection of the brute. That slavery does this, the laws of the States in which it exists abundantly declare. Slaves are "chattels," "estate personal." Slave-holders assembled in convention solemnly affirm in view of northern agitation of the subject, that "masters have the same right to their slaves which they have to any other property."

This asserted and exercised right is the vital principle and substance of the institution. It is the central delusion and transgression; and the evils of the system to white and black are its legitimate consequences. The legal and the leading idea concerning slaves is that they are property: of course, the idea that they are men, invested with the rights of men, practically sinks; and, from the premise that they are property, the conclusion is logical that they may be treated as property. Why should *property*, contrary to the interests of the proprietor, be exempt from sale, receive instruction, give testimony in court, hold estate, preserve family ties, be loved as the owner loves himself, in fine, enjoy all or any of the "inalienable rights" of *man*? It is because they are held as property, that slaves are sold; because they are property, families are torn



asunder; because they are property, instruction is denied them; because they are property, the law, and the public sentiment that makes the law, crush them as men.

We do not here call in question the mitigations with which Christian masters temper into mildness the hard working of an evil system. Those mitigations do not, however, logically or morally defend slavery. Nay, they condemn it; for they are practical tributes to the fact that the laws of humanity, not of property, are binding in respect to the slaves. Hence they really show the inherent inconsistency of the idea, and the unrighteousness of the system which regards men as property.

Notwithstanding those mitigations, the system itself, like every wrong system, produces characteristic evils, which can be prevented only by removing their cause, the false doctrine that men can be rightfully held in ownership. Fallen as man is, no prophet was needed to foretell at the first the dreadful facts that have been recorded in the bitter history of man's claim of property in man. Such a history must always be a scroll written within and without with lamentations and mourning and woe. Man is not a safe depository of such power. A human institution which subverts a divine institution, and which

carries with it the assumption of a divine prerogative in constituting a new species of property, naturally saps the foundations of every other divine institution and law which stands in its way. Hence, for example, the fall of the domestic institution before that of slavery.

The inherent wrongfulness of American slavery as a legal and social institution is therefore clearly demonstrated. It formally abolishes by law and usage a divine institution. Hence, in its practical operation, it sets aside other divine institutions and laws. Consequently it stands in the same relations to the divine government with the abolition of the Sabbath by infidel France, and with the perversion of the family institution by the Mormon territory of Utah.

Here the fundamental argument from the Bible rests. But slavery justifies itself by the Bible. It becomes essential, therefore, to examine the validness of this justification.

There are but two possible ways of avoiding the conclusion that has been reached. To vindicate slavery it must be proved, first, that God has abolished the original institution, conferring on men universally the right to hold property; or, secondly, it must be proved, that, while he has by special enactments taken away from a portion of mankind the right to hold property, he has

given to other men the right to hold the former as property. Further, to justify American slavery, it must be shown that these special enactments include the African race and the American States.

In regard to the first point we simply remark, it is morally impossible that God should permanently and generally abolish the original institution concerning property; because, as in the case of its coevals, the Sabbath and marriage, the reason for it is permanent and unchangeable, and "*lex stat dum ratio manet*," the law stands while the reason remains. Moreover, there is not a word of such repeal in the Bible. That institution, therefore, is still a charter of rights for the children of men. Till it is assailed, more need not be said.

As to the second point, we believe that careful investigation will prove conclusively, that no special enactments are now in force which arrest or modify the institutions of Eden, in regard to any state or any persons. It will, then, remain demonstrated, that the legal system of slavery exists utterly without warrant of the Holy Scriptures, and in defiance of the authority of the Creator. The word of God is throughout consistent.

It is here freely admitted, that God can arrest the operation of general laws by special statutes.

He can take away from men the right to hold property which he has given, and, if he please, constitute them the property of other men. It is, in this respect, as it is with life. God can take what he gives. If, then, he has given authority to individuals or to nations to hold others as property, they may do so. Nay, more; if their commission is imperative, they must do so. But such an act of God creates an *exception* to his own fundamental law, and, like all exceptions, conveys its own restrictions, and *proves the rule*. It imposes no yoke, save upon those appointed to subjugation. It confers no authority, save upon those specifically invested with it. They are bound to keep absolutely within the prescribed terms, and no others can innocently seize their delegated dominion. Outside of the excepted parties the universal law has sway unimpaired. It is in this instance as it is in regard to marriage. God permitted the patriarchs to multiply their wives; but monogamy is now a sacred institution for the world. So the supreme Disposer can make a slave, or a nation of slaves; and the world shall be even the more solemnly bound by the original institutes concerning property. It follows, without a chasm in the argument, or a doubtful step, that, when persons or States reduce men to the condition of chat-

tels, *without divine authorization*, they are guilty of subverting a divine institution; and, since it is the prerogative of God to determine what shall be property, they are chargeable with a presumptuous usurpation of divine prerogative, in making property, so far as human force and law can do it, of those whom Jehovah has created in his own image, and invested with all the original rights of men.

The soundness of the principle contained in these remarks, both in law and in biblical interpretation, will not be questioned. In the light of it, let us examine briefly the justifications of slavery as derived from the Bible. Happily the principle itself saves the labor of minute and protracted criticism.

We first consider the curse pronounced upon Canaan by Noah. Admitting all that is necessary to the support of slavery, namely, that that curse constituted the descendants of *Canaan* the property of some other tribe or people, upon whom it conferred the right of holding them as property, yet even so this passage does not justify but condemns American slavery; for that curse does not touch the African race: *they are not descendants of Canaan*;\* and it

\* Genesis, 10th Chapter. Vide, Kitto's Cyclopædia, for views in this connection.



gives no rights to American States. In later times the Canaanites were devoted to destruction for their sins. The Hebrews were the agents appointed by Jehovah to this work of retribution. It was not, however, accomplished in their entire extermination. In the case of the Gibeonites it was formally commuted to servitude, and other nations occupying the promised land were made tributary. Thus the curse upon Canaan was fulfilled by *authorized executioners* of divine justice.

What light does the whole history now throw upon slavery? It is plain the curse was a judicial act of God concerning Canaan. It follows that conquest with extermination or servitude was a judgment of God, which he appointed his chosen people to execute. It follows further, that those, who, without his commission, reduce to bondage men who are not descendants of Canaan, do inflict a curse on those whom he has not cursed; and thus virtually assume his most awful prerogative as the Judge of guilty nations.

We then inquire whether the States of the South have received warrant for enslaving any portion of mankind. Has God *given* them the African race as property? Where is the commission? The argument fails to justify modern slavery for the same reason identically that it fails to justify offensive war and conquest. God

has not given the right — has neither proclaimed the curse, nor commissioned the agent of the curse. Christian States in America seize it, and lay it upon those whom he has not cursed. The passage of his word which has been considered affords them no sanction.

We proceed to another passage. It is supposed by many to be an incontrovertible defence of modern slavery, that the Hebrews were authorized to buy bondmen and bondmaids of the heathen round about them. Let us candidly examine this defence.

Why were the Hebrews authorized by God in express terms to buy servants, and possess them as their "money?" Evidently *because they did not otherwise have this authority*. Human beings, as we have seen, were not "given" in the grant of property. They do not, therefore, fall within the scope of the general laws of property. If they had so fallen, the special statutes, by which the Hebrews purchased them, would have been as gratuitous as special enactments for buying animals, trees, and minerals. *Of all nations they only have possessed this right; for they only received it by special bestowment*. The rest of mankind have ever been prohibited from assuming it by fundamental laws. If ever there was a case in which the exception proves the rule, that case

is before us; and therefore a chasm yawns between the premise and the conclusion defensive of slavery, which no exegesis and no logic can bridge over.

-1 To illustrate the strength of this argument, let the fact be observed, that, if it could be set aside, it would follow, by parity of reasoning, that the clergy of our country, regardless of fundamental laws, have right to take possession of a tenth part of the estates and incomes of their fellow-citizens, because the Levites in this manner received their inheritance among their brethren. It is plain, however, that, as in regard to other interests no less important than liberty or slavery, so also in regard to slavery itself, the special laws of the Old Testament are no longer in force; 1 whence it follows that the vital doctrine of the system, "masters have the same right to their slaves which they have to any other property," is totally erroneous. The institution which claims solid foundation here is built on nothing.

We cannot forbear to adduce an instance of unexceptionable testimony to the validity of this reasoning. In one or two famous articles on slavery and abolitionism, the Princeton Repository adopts it, with another application, and says, "So far as polygamy and divorce were permitted under the old dispensation they were lawful, and

became so by that permission; and they ceased to be lawful when that permission was withdrawn, and a new law given. That Christ did give a new law is abundantly evident." In the same manner, 'so far as' slavery 'was permitted under the old dispensation it was lawful, and became so by that permission; and it ceased to be lawful when that permission was withdrawn, and a new law given.' It is true, however, only in a qualified sense, that Christ gave "a new law" concerning polygamy and divorce. His law restored the original institution of marriage, as in Eden; and this was "new" to the Jews, because there had been departure from it. In like manner the New Testament, if not the very words of Christ, now gives a new law concerning slavery in the same sense; that is, as will appear, in the sequel, the Christian precepts restore the original institution concerning property as well as concerning marriage. The laws which allowed polygamy and slavery, and therefore the right, passed away together.

Here we leave the Old Testament. No other passages need examination; for all consist with these positions. So far as that sacred volume gives light, the world are bound by the laws and have equal right to the full blessings of three divine institutions, whose foundations were laid in

Paradise, and whose complete and glorious proportions will encompass the universal, millennial felicity.

The defence of slavery from the New Testament now demands brief notice. We desire to allow it full force, while we ask the reader's candid judgment of the conclusion.

Of course, the New Testament sanctions now what it sanctioned in the days of its authors.

— That must have been *Roman, not Hebrew*, slavery; for they lived and wrote to men under Roman law. Besides, there is reason to believe, as Kitto states, that the Jews at that time held no slaves. In point of historic truth, it appears that the Mosaic law, finding slavery in existence, practically operated as a system of gradual emancipation for its extinction. “There is no evidence that Christ ever came in contact with slavery.” This sufficiently explains why he did not give a “new law” concerning it in specific terms. — The occasion did not arise, as it did arise in regard to polygamy and divorce, with which he did come in contact. Furthermore, there was no need of new law, other than was actually given.

The argument from the New Testament for the rightfulness of slavery is twofold, being built on the instructions given to masters and servants. It fails on both sides.



For, first, the precepts addressed to servants convey no authority to national rulers or to private individuals to set aside the institution of Jehovah by reducing men to the condition of slaves. These precepts simply enjoin the conduct which Christianity required in their actual situation. They do not vindicate the law and usage by which they were held as property. This is abundantly evident in the texts themselves, and more emphatically, when they are compared with the parallel cases.

Christ promulgated these rules. "I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." Does this empower States to legalize fraud and violence? Does it transmute all the *evil* which Jesus' disciples have endured into *righteousness* of those who have inflicted the evil? Does it wash the crimsoned hands of persecutors in innocency? Does it justify the wilful smiter? All men know better. No one contends for such exposition. Yet it is indispensable to the interpretation which finds a justification of slavery in precepts which enjoin obedience on slaves. That obedience is required on other grounds.

Another example. The New Testament explicitly commands citizens to submit to the civil power. Does this sanctify the tyranny of a Nero or a Nicholas? In the enjoined submission of subjects, has the despot, or the state, full license for edicts and acts of oppression and iniquity? Yet they are logically compelled to admit this, and thus, in theory at least, banish freedom from the whole earth, who find in commands addressed to servants power conferred on legislators and masters to make them slaves, that is, to hold them as property. Instead of this, the rights and obligations of rulers, and of those who claim to be owners of their fellow men, are defined in a very different class of instructions.

Secondly, the instructions addressed to masters forbid the exercise of the right which is assumed in slavery. To make this clear, we observe, primarily, there is no passage in the New Testament which *institutes* the relation of men held in ownership by men. There is no direct reference to the civil laws which constituted this relation. They are passed by silently, as are the laws that established idolatry, and kindled the fires of persecution. Their existence is tacitly acknowledged in the use of the terms which designate masters and servants; and that is all.

Hence those who find here an apology for slavery are obliged to refer to secular history for the facts and definitions on which their argument rests. Accordingly, no passage in the New Testament would be void of meaning, though slavery should cease. In this respect the Constitution of the United States resembles the sacred books; for not one word of that instrument, interpreted on just principles as the palladium of liberty, needs to be obliterated in the abolition of slavery. Furthermore, and this covers our position, the New Testament, disregarding the Roman law, refers masters exclusively to the law of God as their rule for the treatment of servants. A single citation, with which all passages agree, is sufficient to show this. "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." Now, as none can find in such precepts a right to destroy God's primary institution concerning the family, no more can they find in them a right to destroy his primary and universal institution concerning property. Stronger than this, the conclusion is inevitable, that the very precepts which are relied upon to support American slavery do condemn and destroy it; for the law of God, by which they bind masters, ordaining from Eden what is just and equal

- between men, abolishes the fundamental and central law of the system.\*

\* Col. 4: 1; "Ye masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal." That is, act towards them on the principles of justice and equity. Justice requires that all their rights, as men, as husbands, and as parents, should be regarded. And these rights are not to be determined by the civil law, but by the law of God. . . . But God concedes nothing to the master beyond what the law of love allows. Paul requires for servants not only what is strictly just, but — *τὴν ἰσότητα*. What is that? Literally, it is *equality*. This is not only its signification, but its meaning. Servants are to be treated by their masters on the principles of equality. Not that they are to be equal with their masters in authority or station or circumstances; but that they are to be treated as having, as men, as husbands, and as parents, equal rights with their masters. It is just as great a sin to deprive a servant of the just recompense for his labor, or to keep him in ignorance, or to take from him his wife or child, as it is to act thus towards a free man. This is the equality which the law of God demands, and on this principle the final judgment is to be administered. Christ will punish the master for defrauding the servant as severely as he will punish the servant for robbing his master. The same penalty will be inflicted for the violation of the conjugal or parental rights of the one as of the other. For, as the apostle adds, there is no respect of persons with him. At his bar the question will be, "What was done?" not "Who did it?" Paul carries this so far as to apply the principle not only to the acts, but to the temper of masters. They are not only to act towards their servants on the principles of justice and equity, but are to *avoid threatening*. This includes all mani-

It is argued, indeed, that slavery is right, because masters, as well as fathers and rulers, may require obedience. The argument fails utterly; for there is at the foundation no analogy in the cases. The family and the State are divine institutions, having sanction in the Bible; but slavery subverts a divine institution. Fathers and rulers, *as such*, have duties and rights suitable to the relations they sustain by the will of God. Masters, *as such*, have no *rights*; for their relation, as holding property in men, is contrary to his will. Their duty, to which they are bound by the solemn consideration that he is their Master, is practically to restore to their servants the rights which he confers upon all; for nothing less than this can be just and equal in his sight.

This view discloses the harmony of the whole Bible concerning slavery; and, in the light of the two Testaments, the institution stands as a legalized violation of the positive will of Jehovah.

festation of contempt and ill temper, or undue severity. All this is enforced by the consideration that masters have a Master in heaven, to whom they are responsible for their treatment of their servants. . . . Believers will act in conformity with the Gospel in this. And the result of such obedience, if it could become general, would be, that first the evils of slavery, and then slavery itself, would pass away naturally, and as healthfully as children cease to be minors.

*Prof. Hodge's Commentary.*



We now condense the whole argument into its briefest form, in the following syllogisms.

The entire right of men to hold property is given by the Creator. He gives to American States and citizens no right to hold property in men. Therefore they have no such right.

Again. An institution is sinful, which, without divine warrant, holds property in men, thus assuming a divine prerogative, and subverting a divine institution. American slavery does this. Therefore it is a sinful institution.

The purpose of this tract now introduces a new series of topics. The argument demands its application; and the exigencies of the times present momentous questions, which it must answer.

Hitherto we have spoken of the system of slavery. We come now to persons connected with it. Because the system is sinful, the question immediately occurs, who are chargeable with the sin; for there is no sin without sinners. The answer is obvious. They are chargeable who founded it, and all who wilfully implicate themselves with it. Practically, they are always chargeable who adopt it as their own in theory and practice, who support it in the State, consecrate it in the Church, and labor for its extension. They are chargeable, for they bring heresy

into creeds, unrighteousness into legislation, and crime into popular usage. If they are masters, they stand in the same moral relations with persecutors and tyrannical rulers, guilty for all personal injuries they inflict under color of unjust laws; and, whether masters or not, they are guilty for exerting their influence to sustain laws which set aside the authority of God, and withhold the rights he has given. Such men are accountable to God and to society for deliberate, organized, aggressive iniquity. The "organic sin" of the State is their sin, the sin of each in his own measure; for they are the individuals who determine the acts and the character of the slave-holding State as such.

But are there no exceptions among slaveholders? We trust there are many. There is a plain distinction between wicked laws and the personal acts of men who live under those laws. Some may approve them, and use or abuse them to the injury of their fellow men. Others may disapprove them, and refuse, by means of them, to do or justify a wrong. Christians may become in a legal sense owners of slaves, while they heartily deprecate the system of oppression, while they are ready to unite with good men in feasible and wise measures for its removal, and while they obey the Christian precepts towards

their servants, rendering unto them what is just and equal to men and brethren in Christ. Such Christians and such men do not hold slaves in the sense which God forbids; and they cannot be charged with the wickedness of laws by which they, as well as the slaves, are oppressed. On their estates a higher law than that of slavery has sway. To them their slaves, though legally property, are morally and actually men. The Bible sustains their position. They are the Phil-emons to whom Paul gives fellowship, and Ones-imus returns, not as a slave, but a brother beloved. In the trials of their situation they should receive the cordial sympathy of Christians everywhere. It is, indeed, to their sound convictions and their political influence the world must look, in part at least, for the ultimate, peaceful extinction of American slavery. Without them, what would the South become? With the Scriptures in our hand we earnestly say to them, "Throw the weight of your influence against unrighteous laws, fulfil to servants the law of God, and you shall have the sympathy and confidence of good men everywhere. Nay, more; you, with their help, and they with your help, will confine the spreading curse, till, with God's blessing, it shall cease; and Christian and civilized man shall have no more communion with it."

These discriminations answer certain ecclesiastical questions, which have occasioned much perplexity and discord. When properly applied, they take away whatever support a wicked institution has found by leaning upon the Church; at the same time they award to consistent Christians what is due to them by the religion of Jesus. If it shall be said, there will be practical difficulty in applying these discriminations, it is sufficient to answer, it will be less than the difficulty of disregarding them.

The question now arises, what can be done for the restriction and ultimate extinction of slavery as it is; for, since it is sinful, Christianity and patriotism declare it should be restrained and abolished.

First. The extension of slavery can and should be prevented by the Federal Government. The Scriptures have shown us, that the people in their sovereignty have not the right to create a slave State or a slave. Of course, the legislators and presidents, who receive in trust the power which emanates from the people, have no such right. If the Constitution assumed to confer this power, it would be the first national duty to amend that instrument in this particular. There is no power on earth competent to set aside either of the Creator's original institutions for man. But, ac-

according to the sound and established principle of strict construction, the Constitution as it is does not create slavery, or even acknowledge its existence, except by inference. Hence there is no legal objection to the measure which religion herself ordains. The religious and the political obligations of all citizens and all legislators coincide to protect, under the jurisdiction of Congress, the right of every man to be exempt from the condition of property, and to enjoy the property which he honestly earns. Thus the question concerning slavery and the territories is morally settled by divine authority; and to this no real objection can be made, except by that great interest, whose existence is inherently unrighteous and irreligious.

Secondly. In the slave States, legislation should restore to the enslaved population the primitive rights which God has given to all men, establishing for them, on humane and Christian principles, such relations as are suitable to their condition of poverty, ignorance, and dependence, and are adapted to secure at once their improvement and the general welfare.

This is the logical conclusion to be derived from the premises. As the central wrong of slavery consists in making men articles of property by law, the rectification is to lift from them by law the curse of the false and irreligious doctrine,



that they can be rightfully held as property. Thus the axe is laid to the root of the tree.

This is also the conclusion to which we are forced by other moral principles bearing on the case. For men to receive services of men is right. Accordingly, the New Testament allows masters to receive services of those who are slaves in the sense of human law; but at the same time the sacred book requires masters, with all who employ labor, to make the recompenses which are just and equal towards men; for slavery is not right; and legislators, on their responsibility to the Ruler of nations, are bound to adjust the laws in harmony with the first principles of individual and moral obligation.

Furthermore, this is the only practical conclusion. By inevitable necessity, the slaves, as a body, must remain on the soil of their bondage. Only exceptional cases of removal can occur. They are the laborers of the South; and no State will, or can, or is bound, to remove its laborers. It is simply bound to protect and treat them with Christian equity and kindness. Banishment of them would be injustice and cruelty, violating perhaps no less than restoring divine rights. Moreover, no practicable means of removing them have ever been seriously proposed; and, till they shall be, the point needs no discussion.

But the question may be raised, "Are the slaves to endure their present wrongs until the laws shall be thus renewed, or perhaps forever?" We reply, in showing how slave-holders can cease from guilty connection with slavery; we have also shown how the situation of the slaves becomes one of practical righteousness, before the laws can be readjusted; and for this great obligation of the body politic, sufficient time must be allowed. Moral principles do not exact natural impossibilities. The elevation of oppressed millions can be accomplished only in harmony with great natural and social, as well as ethical laws, which the wisdom of God has ordained.

It remains therefore, that, for a period of which no man can see the end, the slaves must, in most cases, dwell within the present boundaries; but it is incumbent on the citizens and legislators of the South to institute *immediate* measures for restoring to them the inviolable rights of men. So long as they continue, by the *necessities* of the case, in the relation of servants and laborers, masters should deal with them according to the rules of humane and Christian equity, paying to them in suitable ways their just earnings, holding sacred their family ties, and securing to them the privileges of education and religion. Meanwhile,

the legislatures of the several States, by wise enactments, should coöperate with masters in training their servile population for the position which the Creator designed for men.

When these things shall come to pass, a consideration, in which many good men have sought relief in regard to slavery, will have multiplied force. The providential wisdom of God, in bringing millions of the children of Africa from a land of pagan darkness and violence to a land of freedom and Christianity, will shine with new lustre, when they shall receive from American hands, together with true religion, every divine right, and shall thus be qualified and enabled to convey to the dark habitations of their fathers the infinite blessings of enlightened liberty and of the gospel of eternal salvation.

These things are practicable. So long as "righteousness exalteth a nation," a great, free, and Christian people can do what they should do; and thus only can they secure, under the divine blessing, their own highest prosperity and glory. To prove this would be simply to repeat the familiar facts which exhibit the legitimate effects of slavery on general intelligence, enterprise, and virtue.

But what shall produce the true and wide spread public sentiment, which is indispensable to usher in so radical a change in the laws and

institutions of proud and powerful States? Truth must accomplish this great work — THE TRUTH that our Creator does not place those who bear his image in bondage to their fellow men as property, but invests them with a common and inviolable right of dominion over inferior things. The vivid light which this truth sheds on the social relations of men has been extinguished at the South; and it has been dimmed at the North. In every right way and in every place, therefore, it should be made to shine again unobscured. Expounders should bring it forth from the Holy Oracles; for Jehovah has hallowed it there, and made it equal in authority with the Sabbath. The press should publish it; for it is the function of the press to convey unceasingly to the public mind whatever will establish and crown the public integrity and welfare. All men should seal it in their hearts; for it is the divine rule and bond of brotherhood in the universal dominion. It surrounds them with protected families, and builds their safe firesides and their altars of worship.

The question arises here, can general agreement be expected in regard to this primary truth, and measures which legitimately proceed from it. It is to be supposed there are men in whose hearts there is no fear of God or love of their fellow beings. With such men these views

may be powerless ; but for men of Christian principle, we are confident they show a common foundation for united sentiments and efforts.

There is now a general, practical, vital consent that government and society should respect the divine institutions of the family and the Sabbath. Beneath all superficial strifes and irrelevant issues, there is the same sure ground for a living and earnest agreement, that government and society should respect the equal and coeval institution of the right of property.

Christian and conservative men can unite in the proposed measures and the truth which appoints them ; for they desire to preserve only what is right. Christian and progressive men can unite in them ; for they desire to abolish only what is wrong. Politics can approve them ; for they are constitutional and patriotic. Philanthropy can be satisfied with them ; for they promise all that in the nature of the case can be promised for the early relief of the slaves. Religion sanctions them ; for they restore her own institutions. Good men of the South can unite in them with those of the North ; for they have equal authority North and South. They proffer only that moral aid which great communities, sharing common interests and responsibilities, should render and receive with intimate and



cordial confidence. They honor the sovereignty of proud and jealous States; for each of them, exercising the power which springs from its own people in its own way, will discharge its political obligations to all within its boundaries.

A few years or even months of combined efforts will suffice to convey this truth with vital energy to millions of minds and hearts. In due time it will manifest its efficacy in the public sentiment and public policy. We trust in its power. It is invincible; it will be victorious; for it is from God. Its absence from the popular and legislative mind well explains many of the evils that have been precipitated upon the nation. Its future prevalence, under divine mercy, will arrest the progress of events which would be, as we judge, not remedy, but retributive destruction, on account of slavery.

This leads us to the final question. Are the principles and measures advocated in this tract or their equivalents, with the contemplated result, essential to the welfare of our country? We are compelled to believe so.

We present, for the consideration of citizens and statesmen, this fact. In harmony with that law of fitness which pervades the Creator's works, all men are constituted with a nature corresponding with the dominion they have received. They

feel that they have a right to hold property, and should not be held as property. Slaves feel this. Masters often show that they feel it. They who make laws for slavery, North and South, show that they feel it. The little property which slaves are often allowed to possess, so far from furnishing apology for slavery, is an unwitting tribute to the living principle that destroys the system. Here is a philosophical demonstration that slavery cannot stand in perpetuity. This vital element in human nature, to which a divine institution itself is but an index, is subterranean fire beneath the pyramid of oppression. Though long crushed and silent, it will not always sleep. Do men expect to control forever, by law and force, that sense of rights which burns inextinguishable in every human breast, which God himself kindled in Eden? As well pile rocks on volcanoes to suppress earthquakes.

“Vital in every part,  
It can but by annihilating die.”

In this light, it is no prediction to say, if slavery survives to consummate its own results it will destroy our country.

The great political and religious problem of the slave-holding States, on which their welfare really depends, is not, how shall we extend sla-

very? but, how shall we lay legal foundation for the rights of our servile population as men? Unless it shall be anticipated and prevented, by restoring to them the dominion which the Creator bestowed, a day is as sure to come on natural principles as the sun to rise, when the masses of human property will assert for themselves the indestructible rights of their being. Generations may not see it; but woe betides the States implicated in this oppression, when that day shall dawn; and the longer it tarries the greater the woe.

To our mind, the statesmen are infatuated who do not in their policy regard this universal sense of rights. It is this which is now making so bitter conflict on the prairies of Kansas. It will always make conflict, till slavery expires.

In connection with the general welfare, there is another consideration, which we solemnly urge upon every man who respects the Bible. It is the displeasure of God for slavery. He gave the rights which it denies; and he will assuredly vindicate his own institutions. It would contradict his word and history, which is but the story of his providence, to suppose that he will perpetually allow myriads of men, in this land of light, to hold as property other myriads and even millions of their fellow men and fellow Christians,

whom he has endowed, as bearing his own image, with equal rights. With Jefferson we have reason to tremble for our country, when we behold her support of slavery and remember that God is just. France abolished the Sabbath; and thrones have gone down in blood. America may abolish another divine institution; and for this her proud States may be convulsed. The previous topic shows, indeed, that God has so constituted the social elements of this world, that a great wrong, like slavery, ultimately provides for its own retribution. The oppressor himself treasures up the vials of wrath for Him who taketh vengeance.

In view of all the considerations which have now passed before our minds, is it too much to believe, that the diffusion of kindly and scriptural sentiments, with the blessing of heaven producing general agreement in principles and measures, must be the means of our country's salvation from the guilt and perils of slavery? If it is not extended, misguided, infatuated men may, indeed, threaten to dissolve the Union. Still we fear that extension most; for religion teaches us to fear God more than man. It allows us but this alternative, to keep his commandments, and trust that he will make the wrath of man to praise him. We hold that national righteous-

ness in his sight, "first pure, then peaceable," is better and safer than union and slavery with his frown. Let justice be done, and the heavens will not fall.

Whatever purposes God may conceal in the cloudy future, present duties are ours. He seals them in his word. Notwithstanding all the heats and perversions of parties and interests, we trust there will yet be a single voice of our nation's good men. Citizens will speak the truth, legislators will enact the truth, churches will hallow the truth, vital to civilization and Christianity, that, by Jehovah's will, man is not the property of man. Then, under the benediction of our Father in heaven, all his children in mutual protection and benevolence will enjoy their property, their homes, and their Sabbath; and he will more richly bless the land of the free and the just.



**FRIENDLY LETTERS**

**TO**

**A CHRISTIAN SLAVEHOLDER.**

**BY**

**REV. A. C. BALDWIN.**

**(39)**



## LETTER I.

INTRODUCTION. — SOUTHERN COURTESY AND HOSPITALITY. — CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SOUTH AND NORTH. — NO ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE AT HEART. — THEY SHOULD UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER BETTER. — A FREE INTERCHANGE OF SENTIMENT DESIRABLE. — SINCERE PATRIOTISM AND PIETY COMMON TO BOTH. — THESE AN EFFECTUAL SAFEGUARD TO OUR UNION AND GOOD-FELLOWSHIP.

MY DEAR CHRISTIAN BROTHER, — I embrace the first moment at my command since leaving your pleasant home, to express the gratification afforded me by my recent visit to the “Sunny South.” The kind hospitality and polite attentions shown me by yourself and other Christian friends, during my recent interesting sojourn with you, will ever be gratefully remembered. I had previously heard “by the hearing of the ear” of the open, frank warm-heartedness and generous impulses of southern people, but now I can fully appreciate them. The lessons taught us by experience, whether they be pleasant or painful, are the most profitable, and are most

deeply engraven upon the memory. If there are any persons who think or speak lightly of the reputed complaisance and Christian courtesy of those who live south of "Mason and Dixon's line," I have only to say to them, — go and make the acquaintance of those families which give the tone and character to society there, and enjoy the hospitalities which they almost force upon you with so much politeness and delicacy as to make you feel that by sharing them you are conferring rather than receiving a favor, and your skepticism on this point will be happily and effectually removed.

You will not understand me, my dear sir, as implying that our southern brethren have really more heart than we at the North, although there seems to be "*primâ facie*" evidence in your favor; at least, so far as polite and generous attention to strangers is concerned. In this last particular, you are constantly teaching us important lessons. Still, I contend that the Northerner has as large and generous a soul, when you get at it, as anybody. We have hearts which beat warm and true, but our cautious habits and constitutional temperament (phlegmatic sometimes) conceal them from view; whereas you carry yours throbbing with generous emotions in your hands, exposed to the

gaze of everybody. The Southron is artless and impulsive, as well as noble; the Northerner is no less noble, but having been taught more frequently the doctrine of "expediency" than his southern brother, he stops and "calculates" when, and in what circumstances, it is best to exhibit his whole character. In both cases, the pure gold is there; but in the former it lies upon the surface or in the alluvial, while in the latter it is often imbedded deep in the quartz-rock;— it requires some labor to get it out, but the ultimate yield is most rich and abundant.

It is very desirable that a greater degree of social intercourse be kept up between the North and South. We are brethren of one great family, and there is no good reason why this family should not be a united and happy one. To a considerable extent it is so. It is true we do not all think alike on every subject, and some of these subjects are of vast importance, and intimately connected with our prosperity and happiness. We need to understand each other better, and to this end there should be more intimacy, and a frequent and free interchange of views;— not for strife and debate, but for mutual edification and enlightenment. There was probably never a family of brothers, however strong their love for each other, whose views



of domestic policy were exactly alike ; but there need be no lack of fraternal confidence and harmony for all that. There are certain great fundamental principles which underlie every thing else, and form the basis of the family compact. These principles are filial reverence, fraternal affection, love for home, and a watchful jealousy of aught that can in the least interfere with the happiness or reputation of their beloved family circle. Falling back upon these principles to preserve good-will and harmony, they are not in the least afraid to discuss those topics on which there is an honest difference of opinion ; on the contrary, they take pleasure in doing so, for the result is a strengthening of the ties which bind them to each other, and a modification and partial blending of opinions that seemed antagonistic.

Thus it should be in our great political and religious brotherhood. The North and South have each their peculiar views of what pertains to their own interests, and the interests of the great family of the Republic. But do not let us stand at a distance and look at each other with an eye of jealousy because of these differences. Surely we can meet as fellow-citizens, and discuss matters of common interest, and the

interests of common humanity, without losing our temper or engendering any ill feeling or family discord.

It is affirmed by some, that there are certain subjects, at least one, of so peculiar and delicate a nature as to forbid discussion, lest the result should be heart-burnings, alienation, and perhaps disunion in our happy fraternity. I cannot for a moment admit the sentiment. It is an ungenerous reflection upon the courtesy, Christian candor, piety, and good-sense, both of the North and South. I hold that good citizens and good Christians can, if they will, discuss any subject without giving the least occasion for offence, or endangering that compact which so happily binds us together. As it is in the family circle, there are certain great principles most dear to us all, on which we can fall back, and which, if we are true to ourselves and to them, will prove efficient safeguards to our temper and good-fellowship. The first of these is Patriotism. We have a common country, and we love it, and we love each other for our country's sake. We are children of a common mother, whose kind arms have encircled us, and whose bosom has nourished us bounteously and with impartiality, and God forbid, that, as wayward, ungrateful children,

we should wring her maternal heart with anguish by our unfraternal conduct toward each other. We shall not do it,—either at the North or at the South. We are true patriots, and in our very differences, love of country come in as an important element to shape and modify our opinions; and while we may be adopting different theories, we are conscientiously seeking the same end, namely, the greatest good of our beloved country.

- The second is piety. We love our country well, but we love our Saviour more, and for his sake we will love and treat each other as brethren, and not fall out by the way because we may not see through the same optic-glasses. We will cheerfully hear what each has to say on whatever pertains to Christian morals and practice. There are thousands of sincere, warm-hearted Christians, whose love to Christ raises them immeasurably above sectionalism and prejudice, and who daily inquire, “what is truth?” and “what is duty?” and they entertain that “charity” which “suffereth long and is kind; is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things;” and “never faileth.” When this love is in exercise, Christian brethren may

open their hearts freely to each other on any subject, whether it be "for doctrine, or reproof, or for instruction in righteousness."

Whatever may be true of others, I hope that you and I will be able to demonstrate to the world, that, although one of us lives at the North and the other at the South, yet we can communicate with each other unreservedly on an almost interdicted topic, with mutual kind feelings, if not to edification.

Respectfully and fraternally,

Yours, &c.

## LETTER II.

A DIFFICULT AND DELICATE SUBJECT PROPOSED. — AGITATION OF IT UNAVOIDABLE. — CHRISTIANS NORTH AND SOUTH SHOULD GIVE THE DISCUSSION OF IT A RIGHT DIRECTION. — WE ARE ALL INTERESTED IN THE ISSUE. — NORTHERN DISCLAIMERS.

MY DEAR CHRISTIAN BROTHER, — In my last I intimated that I hoped you and I, by our correspondence, would be able to furnish the world a practical illustration of good-nature and kind feeling in the discussion of a subject that has been a fruitful source of trouble and unchristian invective. You have already anticipated my theme — it is DOMESTIC SLAVERY. It must be confessed that this is the most difficult and delicate of all topics to be agitated by a Northerner and a Southerner, and yet I have the fullest confidence that neither of us will give or take offence. I need offer you no apology for calling your attention to this subject at the present time. Not only is it a theme of vast importance in itself, involving, either directly or indirectly, in-



terests most dear to you and to me, and to every one who has at heart the welfare of his country and his race, but it is a subject that must be discussed, — there is no avoiding it, however much you or I or other individuals may desire it. It has come before the public mind in such a manner as peremptorily to demand the attention of every Christian and every patriot. Whether we approve or deprecate the peculiar causes that have made this topic so prominent in our country, both North and South, we have to take things as they are, and turn them to the best possible account. Politicians and demagogues are all discussing American slavery, and will continue to do so for the purpose of forwarding their own favorite schemes; and any attempt to silence them would be as futile as an effort to arrest the gulf-stream in its course. It remains only for brethren, both at the South and North, to take up the subject as we find it brought to our hands in the inscrutable providence of God, and, under the guidance of his Spirit, given in answer to our prayers, take a truly Christian view of some of its leading features, and then inquire, What is duty? I think you will not claim, with some of your southern friends, that slavery is a subject with which we at the North “have nothing to do.” As patriots, we

have something to do with every thing that affects the interests of our common country ; and as Christians, we sustain responsibilities which we cannot shake off toward all our brethren of the human family, whether it be at the North or South — whether they be bond or free. “ Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us? ” “ We are many members, but one body, and whether one member suffer all the members suffer with it ; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.”

Your candor will not impute to me any unkind or improper motive in entering upon this discussion ; and you will permit me, in the outset, to enter a few disclaimers, in order that you may be the better able to appreciate what I have to say.

In the first place, it is not my design to throw down the glove for the purpose of enlisting you, or any of your friends, in a controversy ; this would be an unpleasant and profitless undertaking.

Nor is it to advocate the doctrine, that sustaining the legal relation of master to a slave for a longer or shorter time is in all possible cases sin. I will admit that there may be circumstances in which the relation may subsist without any moral delinquency whatever ; as, for instance,

persons may become slaveholders in the eye of the law without their own consent, as by heirship; they sometimes become so voluntarily to befriend a fellow-creature in distress, to prevent his being sold away from his wife and family; persons sometimes purchase slaves for the sole purpose of emancipating them. In these, and other circumstances which might be mentioned, no reasonable man either North or South would ever think of pronouncing the relation a sinful one.

Nor is it my design to question the conscientiousness or piety of all slaveholders at the South, both among the laity and clergy. Whoever makes the sweeping assertion, that "no slaveholder can be a child of God," gives fearful evidence that he himself is deficient in that "charity" which "hopeth all things." There is an obvious distinction between those who hold slaves for merely selfish purposes and regard them as chattels, and those who repudiate this system, and regard them as men having in common with themselves human rights, and would gladly emancipate them were there not legal obstacles, and could they do it consistently with their welfare, temporal and eternal.

Nor is it my purpose to advocate immediate, universal, unconditional emancipation without

regard to circumstances. This doctrine is not held by the great mass of northern Christians. There are, no doubt, some cases where immediate emancipation would inflict sad calamities, both upon the slaves themselves and the community. The opinions of northern men have often been misunderstood and misrepresented on this subject. The ground that calm, reflecting opponents of slavery take, is, that slaveholders should at once cease in their own minds to regard their slaves as chattels to be bought and sold and worked for mere profit, and that they should take immediate measures for the full emancipation of every one, as soon as may be consistent with his greatest good, and that of the community in which he lives.

This, it is true, is virtually immediate emancipation; for it is at once giving up the chattel principle, and no longer regarding servants as property to be bought and sold. It is to act on the Christian principle of impartial love, doing to them and with them, as, in a change of circumstances, we would have them do to and with us. This does immediately abolish, as it should do, the main thing in slavery, and brings those who are now bondmen into the common brotherhood of human beings, to be treated, not as chattels and brutes, but on Christian princi-

ples, according to the exigencies of their condition as ignorant, degraded, and dependent human beings, "endowed, however, by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," which rights should be acknowledged, and with the least possible delay be granted.

Nor is it my design to reproach my southern brethren as being to blame for the origin of slavery in these United States. Slavery was introduced into this country by our fathers, who have long been sleeping in their graves, and the North, if they did not as extensively, yet did as truly, and in many cases did as heartily, participate in it, as the South; so that, in respect to the origin of American slavery, we have not a word to say, nor a stone to cast. And besides, our mother country must come in and share with our fathers to no small extent in the wrong of introducing domestic slavery to these colonies. Happily, 'as we think, slavery was virtually abolished at the North by our ancestors of a preceding generation; but for their act we are entitled to no credit. Your ancestors omitted to do this; but for their omission you are deserving of no blame. We would never forget, that slavery was entailed upon our southern brethren, and for this entailment they are no more respon-



sible than for the blood that circulates in their veins.

If you will be so kind as to keep these disclaimers in mind, I think you will better understand and appreciate what I shall hereafter say on the subject. With the kindest wishes for you and yours, I remain, in the best of bonds,

YOUR CHRISTIAN BROTHER.

### LETTER III.

THE REAL SUBJECT. — NOT TO BE CONFOUNDED WITH ANCIENT SERVITUDE. — NOR TO BE JUDGED OF BY ISOLATED CASES. — NORTHERN MEN COMPETENT AS OTHERS TO DETERMINE ITS TRUE CHARACTER. — SLAVERY IGNORES OUR DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE. — IS INCONSISTENT WITH OUR CONSTITUTION.

MY DEAR FRIEND AND BROTHER, — I propose in this and subsequent letters to take a brief, candid view of some of the prominent characteristics of American slavery. I speak of servitude, not as it existed in patriarchal times, for that is essentially a distinct matter. While it had some things in common with American slavery, there was so much that was dissimilar in the relation of master and servant, that analogy is in a great measure destroyed.

Neither do I speak of slavery as I saw it developed on your plantation, and on those of your immediate neighbors. When I went to the South, I confess I went with strong prepossessions, (prejudices if you choose so to call them,)

against the "peculiar institution." I regarded it an evil, and only an evil. But while my general views of the legitimate workings of the system remain unchanged, candor compels me to admit, that, if all slaves were as well cared for, as kindly treated, as well instructed, and were they all as contented and happy as yours; and, especially, were there no evils incident to the system greater than I saw with you, I would simply divest slavery of its odious name, and it would virtually be slavery no longer. The plantations at the South would then, perhaps, with some propriety be denominated communities of intelligent, happy, Christian peasants. And yet it is slavery, as it really takes away inalienable rights. Would to God that slavery as it exists with you were a fair illustration of the system. But alas! it is not. Perhaps you may say that "it is impossible for a northern man to speak of slavery so as to do the subject justice." You may indeed know more and better than we do about the state and condition of the slaves. But in some respects, where great principles are involved, we at the North are more competent than you, for our judgment is less liable to be biased by self-interest; and in my remarks I shall confine myself chiefly to those points on which a northern man is at least as well qualified to speak as a slaveholder.

What, then, are some of the prominent characteristics of American slavery as a system ?

FIRST, Slavery ignores and repudiates the foundation-stone on which rests our renowned Declaration of Independence. That document, for more than three fourths of a century, has been the boast and glory of America. It is the platform on which our noble ancestors planted their feet, with a consciousness that they stood on the eternal principles of truth and justice. To maintain these principles, relying on God for aid, they pledged to each other "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor." Our fathers knew that they were right, and, to carry out the principles embodied in this Declaration, many of them cheerfully poured out their heart's blood to defend the "unalienable rights" of humanity.

Now let us turn our attention to the foundation paragraph of this memorable Declaration ;— I do not mean in that general way in which it is often read, but minutely and particularly ;— let us calmly look at it in its full import, and not shrink back and avert our eyes on account of a foreboding that we shall be led to conclusions which we would be glad to avoid.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident;— that all men are created equal ; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights ;

that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These significant words are inscribed upon the scroll of our nation's history, and there they will remain till time shall be no longer. They need no glossary or explanation. He who runs may read them, and he who reads can understand them. The sentiment they embody it is impossible to mistake; it stands out in bold relief, like the sun in the heavens. It is, that every man has received, from a higher than earthly power, a charter, which secures to him the unalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is impossible for the most ultra advocate of "human rights" to paraphrase these words, or give them a rendering so as to make them support his dogmas more strongly than they now do. On the contrary, he would only weaken their force by the attempt.

Now, my dear brother, I would candidly, seriously ask you — I would ask all your southern friends — I would ask everybody, Can the sentiment of that Declaration be consistent with American slavery? Are not slaves men? Do color and degradation change a creature of God from a human being to a soulless brute? No; our southern brethren would as indignantly repudiate this infidel view as we at the North.



Now if a slave is a man, he has received from his Creator an unalienable right to liberty if he chooses to avail himself of it, or else the first principle laid down in our revered Declaration of Independence, so far from being "self evident," is in fact untrue, and ought at once to be taken from its honored position in the archives of these United States, and consigned to the heaps of rubbish of the dark ages.

But does the slave enjoy this liberty? or is it within his reach? It will not be pretended. The very name by which his class is designated forbids it. The term free slave is a solecism. His liberty consists in the freedom to do as he is told to do, or suffer punishment for his disobedience, and he can pursue happiness only in accordance with the will of his master.

There is the same incongruity between slavery and that clause in our constitution which stipulates that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Now, my brother, does it not require considerable ingenuity and special pleading to avoid conclusions to which unbiased common sense would arrive in an instant, in the application of these declared rights to persons held as slaves? I am not going to inflict upon you a dissertation, or a series of syllogisms on this hackneyed

subject, but I beg that you and your friends will calmly look again at what, I doubt not, you have seen before,—the palpable incongruity between the system of holding persons perpetually in slavery without their consent, and those declared, self-evident, heaven bestowed, unalienable rights professedly secured to all men in these United States by our glorious constitution. Said that great statesman and patriot, Henry Clay: “We present to the world the sorry spectacle of a nation that worships Slavery as a household goddess, after having constituted Liberty the presiding divinity over church and state.”

Surely something must be out of joint here. I have looked again and again at this matter, I think with perfect candor, and I have tried to the utmost of my ability to reconcile these apparent inconsistencies, but I cannot do it. Can you?

Believe me, as ever, your sincere friend and

CHRISTIAN BROTHER.

## LETTER IV.

**SLAVERY TRANSFORMS MEN TO CHATTELS. — SOUTHERN LAWS. —  
SLAVE-AUCTIONS. — MEN PLACED ON A LEVEL WITH BRUTES. —  
NO REDRESS FOR WRONGS. — IGNORANCE PERPETUATED BY  
LAW.**

MY DEAR CHRISTIAN FRIEND, — A second characteristic of American slavery is, It regards human beings, declared to be in the “image of God,” as “chattels,” — things or articles of merchandise. “Slaves,” say the laws of South Carolina and Georgia, “shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be chattels personal in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever.”\* “A slave,” says the code of Louisiana, “is one who is in the power of his master, to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his

\* See 2 Brevard’s Digest, 229; Prince’s Digest, 446.

industry, and his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing, but what must belong to his master." \*

Thus, rational, immortal beings, children of our common Father in heaven, are taken from the exalted scale in which God placed them, and degraded to that of the brute creation. They are, as you know, advertised, mortgaged, attached, inherited, leased, bought, and sold like horses and cattle. Like them they are brought to the auction block, and like them subjected to a rigid examination as to their age, and soundness of wind, chest, and limb. Said a gentleman to me: "When I was at —; I visited the slave mart; and as I saw one and another and another of my fellow-beings brought forward to the block, and rudely exposed and minutely examined, in order to ascertain their marketable value in dollars and cents, and then struck off to the highest bidder, amid the gibes and jeers of the vulgar, my heart was nigh unto bursting, and I was obliged to turn away my eyes and weep, exclaiming, O God! can it be! thy children! my brothers and sisters of humanity,—perhaps my fellow-heirs of heaven,—precious souls for whom the Saviour died, whose names

\* Civil Code, Art. 35.

may be written in the Book of Life, and over whose repentance angels may have rejoiced! Can it be?"

For myself, I never witnessed any such scenes, and heaven grant I never may. It is enough, and too much for me to know, that they exist. I allude to them in this connection, not to awaken and pain your sensibilities, but simply to illustrate the fact, that American slavery sanctions them, and by its operation brings down the noblest work of God to a level of the beasts that perish. As far as it can do so, it dehumanizes man, and treats him as a thing without a soul. It may be remarked, however, in passing, "A man's a man, for a' that."

I might speak in this connection of the obstacles which are thrown in the way of the slave's obtaining redress for his wrongs should he unfortunately get into the hands of a cruel and unreasonable master, being forbidden to defend himself, and not allowed the testimony of his brethren to be given in his behalf; but there are other features of this system which more urgently demand our attention.

Neither will I dwell upon the ignorance and mental degradation which are an essential part of the system. You need not be informed, that, in ten States, knowledge is kept from the slave



by legal enactments, — that teaching him to read is regarded a crime, to be severely “punished by the judges.” I was happy to find that you and a great many others totally disregard that law, and, in spite of legislators and penal statutes, you teach your slaves to read, and in some cases to write. For this *crime*, I doubt not but heaven, at least, will forgive you. I shall allude to this latter topic again in a future letter.

Most truly and affectionately, yours, etc.

## LETTER V.

DOMESTIC LIFE. — THE MARRIAGE RELATION. — DOMESTIC HAPPINESS A RELIC OF PARADISE. — ITS ENDEARMENTS. — ITS VALUE. — THE BARBARISM OF INVADING THE DOMESTIC SANCTUARY. — AN ILLUSTRATION.

MY DEAR BROTHER, — I come now, in the third place, to speak of slavery as it is related to the endearments and duties of domestic life. On this subject my heart is full. I am almost afraid to speak, lest I say what I ought not; and yet I cannot keep silence. I can, in a good measure, sympathize with Elihu when he said, —

“For I am full of words,  
The spirit within me doth constrain me,  
Behold I am as wine which hath no vent,  
I am ready to burst like new bottles,  
I will speak that I may breathe more freely,  
I will open my lips and reply.”\*

We now approach a topic more intimately.

\* Job ch. 32, v. 17–20, Barnes’s translation.

connected with the present and future happiness of the human race than almost any other. Man was not completely blest, even in Eden, until God instituted the marriage relation. His Creator gave him a companion to participate in his joys, binding them together by ties which no human power might sunder. Paradise was lost by sin, but as our first parents were exiled thence, God in infinite kindness permitted them to take one of its purest, sweetest sources of joy with them to this world of sorrows.

“Domestic happiness! thou only bliss  
Of Paradise that has survived the fall!”

You, my dear brother, are a husband and a father, and can appreciate my meaning, when I speak of the richness, the tenderness, the depth, of connubial and paternal love; how it lights up this dark world with smiles, — how it stimulates us to manly exertion, — how it lightens the burdens of human life, and enables us cheerfully to sustain its ills, while it almost restores to us Eden itself. To understand what is meant by the term domestic happiness, it is necessary for you and me only to look at the circles around our own firesides, and listen to the musical accents of the loved ones who dwell there, as they pronounce the words husband, father, mother,

brother, sister, and exchange with them kind looks and the affectionate embrace. What earthly joys can be compared with those of home? What would tempt us to part with them? All the gold in California and Australia would be spurned in contempt, if offered in exchange. What should we say, and what should we do, were any power on earth to interfere with our fireside delights, and attempt to wrest them from us?

Suppose Providence had cast our lot under a despotic government, which we will suppose to be for the most part kind and paternal, but having this peculiarity, — every now and then, finding its finances embarrassed, it should be in the habit of selling some of its subjects to a foreign power to strengthen its exchequer, and should arbitrarily select its victims from this family and that; — how should you feel were the doomed family your own? What would have been your emotions this morning, had some one come to your room and told you that that bright-eyed boy, “Willie,” who last night sat upon your knee and amused you with his innocent prattle, showed you his toys, examined your pockets, played with your hair and features, and finally clasped his little arms around your neck and impressed the “good-night” kiss upon your lips,

had been seized by an officer, and sold from your sight forever to you know not whom, and to be carried you know not whither? Nay, more;—suppose that while he was yet speaking, there came also another with the tidings that the same fate had befallen your first-born,—your daughter, just budding into womanhood,—the affectionate, joyous, light-hearted “Kate,” whose voice to your ear is sweeter than the music of flowing waters, whose feet are swifter than those of the light gazelle, as with open arms she bounds to meet you on your return from a temporary absence, to welcome you home with a tear of joy in her eye and a kiss upon her lips,—that she too had been by the officials of the government clandestinely abducted from your dwelling, and sold, literally sold, for a valuation put upon her person in dollars and cents, to a hopeless captivity, to spend her days in unrequited toil, or, not unlikely, in ministering to the caprices and brutal passions of a stranger?

And while he was yet speaking, and as your *wife*, half frantic with grief and terror, was entwining her arms around you, and you were striving to ease your bursting heart, to crown the whole, suppose another official and his posse had entered your apartment, and by force of arms had torn her from your embrace, and with



thongs upon her hands, and a bandage over her mouth, hurried her away to greet your sight no more? What a scene! There go in one direction the children of your body, "bone of your bone, and flesh of your flesh," to an unknown but fearful destiny! In another is ruthlessly borne the object dearer to you than all the world beside, — one whom you had solemnly sworn to love, cherish, and protect until death, — the light of your dwelling, — the mother of your children, — the mutual sharer of all your joys and sorrows, — the richest and most precious treasure heaven ever gave you! — there she goes in an agony of woe, to toil under a burning sun, compelled to call another man her husband, or, it may be, to grace her master's seraglio! Merciful God! what meaneth this? What horde of barbarians from the dark corners of the earth have found their way hither to lay waste all that is beautiful and lovely! What fiend from the pit has been let loose to enter this little Paradise to destroy and bear away all the good that was left of the primitive Eden!

No ruthless band of barbarians from benighted lands have found their way to this Christian domestic sanctuary, — no malignant spirit from below has been here to snatch the only type of Heaven that escaped his grasp six thousand

years ago. "Think it not strange," brother, "concerning this fiery trial as though some strange thing had happened to you." This is only the legitimate working of the patriarchal system of government under which we live. Be calm, — this is all done according to law, and with as much kindness as the circumstances will permit. No stripes are inflicted, and no more force is exerted than is absolutely necessary to secure the object, and prevent a useless outcry; no ill-will is entertained toward the victims of these outrages, — it is only because the finances of the government are low, and must be replenished, and this is the most convenient, and perhaps at present the only practical, way of raising the money!

Now, my brother, what should you and I think of living under a government where such things were permitted by the laws? It would not reconcile us to the administration to be told, that such proceedings as I have supposed are of rare occurrence, and that the general character of the government is kind, that it dislikes exceedingly to sell its subjects, and especially that it has a great repugnance to separating husbands and wives, and breaking up of families, and does it only when severely pressed by pecuniary necessity. To your and my mind this would be altogether unsatisfactory; it would not change our opinion of

the system. No matter if the heart-rending scene I have supposed were witnessed only once a year, or once in ten years,—I think we should loudly protest against a system which allowed the occurrence of it at all.

You will please, my dear sir, apply the foregoing illustration to the liabilities and actual workings of the slave system at the South, just so far as it is applicable, and no further. If there are any points in which the analogy fails, I will thank you to point them out to me in your next.

With much love and esteem,

I remain yours, most truly.

## LETTER VI.

SACREDNESS OF THE MARRIAGE RELATION.—GOD ALONE CAN DISSOLVE IT.—THE “HIGHER LAW.”—SLAVERY SANCTIONS POLYGAMY AND ADULTERY.—RELATION OF PARENTS TO THEIR CHILDREN.—FEARFUL RESPONSIBILITY ASSUMED.

— MY DEAR CHRISTIAN BROTHER,—My objections to any system of government that interferes at will with the family relation, and forcibly separates husbands and wives, parents and children, do not arise chiefly from the personal wrongs and bitter woes inflicted upon its victims. A contemplation of these is calculated to affect our sensibilities, and excite the tender sympathies of our nature; but there is a more enlarged Christian view which forces itself upon us. If we could by some magic process allay the anguish of the stricken heart, and heal its wounds when the strongest ties of nature are rent asunder,—could we even obliterate the susceptibilities of the soul, destroy natural affection, and render man more callous than the brutes, so

that he could be torn from his home and kindred with less pain than they,—in a *moral* point of view the case would be altered but little. As I have remarked in a previous letter, the *marriage relation* was instituted by God, and he made it indissoluble. “What God hath joined together let not man put asunder,” is the language of “holy writ;” and whoever, for any cause which God himself has not specified, breaks up this relation, encroaches upon God’s prerogative, and goes directly in face of his positive commands. Much has been said of late, seriously, sarcastically, and contemptuously, about a “higher law;” but notwithstanding the improper use often made of that term, there is an important sense in which you, and I, and every Christian recognize what that term implies. If, on any subject whatever, human enactments do obviously conflict with the enactments of God, then God’s law is the “*higher*,” and must be obeyed. To deny this is worse than infidelity.

Now, brother, does not the system of slavery in the United States tolerate, and even authorize, the forcible rending asunder of the marriage tie? Are not husbands, not seldom, but often, sold from their wives, and wives from their husbands, and new matrimonial alliances formed by them, with consent and encouragement of



their masters? Thus is flagrant adultery sanctioned in nearly one half of the States of this Christian Republic, and in some cases the crime is almost, if not quite, forced upon the wretched perpetrators of it. When God's law is disregarded, and an ordinance on which depends all we hold dear in social and Christian life is trampled in the dust by an institution existing in the midst of us, what shall we say? If slavery were a question merely of expediency, political economy, or even personal wrong and suffering, it would be easier to keep silence; but when God is dishonored, and gross sin sanctioned by law, is it not the duty of his children, North and South, to enter their solemn, earnest, decided protestations? You will agree with me, that no Christian can or ought to acquiesce in what, either directly or indirectly, violates a positive divine precept; and against what shall he remonstrate, if not against a system that encourages polygamy and legalizes adultery? \*

\* It is sometimes said that the crime of adultery is neither perpetrated nor encouraged by the breaking up of slave-families, because, generally, the connections formed are not truly marriage, not being solemnized according to forms of law, and hence the marriage obligation *cannot* be violated.

It may be replied, if this be so, it presents slavery in a worse light still, for it encourages and perpetuates a state of universal concubinage. But it is *not* so. When a slave

There is another view in which the operation of the system of slavery, in breaking up families, has affected my mind powerfully and painfully. Parents sustain most important relations to their children, as well as to each other. Who can be so much interested in the temporal and eternal well-being of the child as those by whose instrumentality he had his existence? Who has so much influence over him, or who could direct his feet in the way he should go, so well? God has imposed upon all parents most important duties, which they may not neglect. These duties are as truly incumbent on the slave-parent as on the master who sustains the same relation. It may be, indeed, extensively true that he does not understand them, and is in a great measure incompetent to discharge them; and that often the child suffers nothing morally or intellectually by being removed from his influence. But this results in a great measure from the hopeless ignorance in which the parent is involved. There are, however, as you can bear witness,

takes a companion, and they consent and engage to live together as husband and wife until death, and they thus declare their intentions before others, whether any legal form is gone through or not, they are as truly "no more twain but one flesh" as were Adam and Eve. It has been thus decided by our courts in regard to white persons.

multitudes of exceptions. In how many cases are slave-parents truly pious and intelligent, and feel as much solicitude for the eternal interests of their children, as you do for yours, and pray with them as frequently and as fervently. With how much pleasure did you and I listen to your "Jamie," one time when we were taking an evening stroll past his cabin, and overheard his family prayer. With what simplicity and earnestness did he pour out his soul to God for the salvation of his "dear children." And do you not remember, too, how with equal importunity he prayed God to "bless dear kind Massa and Missus, and dere precious children, and also Massa's friend, and dat all may meet to praise Jesus togedder in heaven," and how we found it difficult to speak for a minute or two, and how the big tear-drops stood in our eyes, and we could n't help it?

You told me there were a great many "Jamies" at the South, and I have no doubt of it; they love their little ones as well, and who so competent to train them up for Christ? Who will presume to step in between these parents and their children and say, this family altar shall be broken down, and those who have bowed around it shall be separated, to meet no more till they meet at the judgment? Who will peril his

own soul by taking those children away from such an influence, and for a pecuniary consideration cast them upon the wide world with none to instruct them, and none to care or pray for them, except their heart-broken parents whom they have left behind? I would not do it, neither would you, for the wealth of the world; and yet, is it not often done? In speaking of this subject, one of the most eminent southern divines\* uses the following language: "Slavery, as it exists among us, sets up between parents and their children an authority higher than the impulse of nature and the laws of God; breaks up the authority of the father over his own offspring, and at pleasure separates the mother at a returnless distance from her child, thus outraging all decency and justice." I shall refer to the sentiments of this brother again.

I remain as ever,

Affectionately yours, etc.

\* Rev. R. I. Breckenridge, D. D.

## LETTER VII.

THE CROWNING EVIL OF SLAVERY. — PRECIOUSNESS OF THE BIBLE. — OUR CHART AND COMPASS ON LIFE'S VOYAGE INDISPENSABLE. — ORAL INSTRUCTIONS INSUFFICIENT. — DANGERS. — SHIPWRECK ALMOST INEVITABLE. — WITHHELD FROM THE SLAVE. — SHUTS MULTITUDES OUT OF HEAVEN. — AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY. — TESTIMONY OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY. — OF SYNOD OF KENTUCKY. — OF DR. BRECKENRIDGE.

MY DEAR BROTHER, — There is one feature of slavery, fourthly, which gives me more pain by far than any other, and I may say more than all others put together, and that is, it imperils the immortal souls of millions of our fellow-beings by keeping from them the Word of God.

Next to the Saviour, and the Holy Spirit, the most precious gift God has bestowed on man is the Bible. This volume contains our only perfect rule of life, and is our only guide to heaven. It teaches us our character and our destiny; it alone raises the curtain between time and eternity, and dissipates the darkness that otherwise would forever enshroud the grave; it reveals to



us another state of being, in which we shall be happy or miserable, ages without end. On this Book alone do we depend for our knowledge of the way of salvation by Christ. It is here we read the story of the manger and the cross, and the wonderful plan of redemption through atoning blood. What could we do without the Bible? It is of infinitely greater value than houses and lands, silver and gold, and every earthly good beside. To take from us the Bible, would be like blotting out the sun in the heavens, and enveloping the universe in the gloom and darkness of eternal night. Take from me riches, honors, pleasures, comforts, and even liberty itself; and give me instead thereof poverty, disgrace, pains, affliction, hunger, cold, nakedness, and a dungeon; tear me from my friends, bind me with chains, scourge me with the lash, brand my flesh with hot irons, deprive me of every source of earthly good, and inflict upon me every kind of bodily and mental anguish which the utmost refinement of cruelty can invent;—but give me my Bible—leave me this precious treasure, which is the gift of my heavenly Father, to teach me his will and guide me to himself. Torture and destroy my body, if you will, but O! give me facilities for saving my soul. Turn me not adrift on life's troubled ocean to seek

alone a far distant shore, exposed continually to storms, breakers, hidden reefs, whirlpools, and shoals, with nothing but a few verbal instructions to direct my way. If I am to make this fearful voyage, (and make it I must,) take not from me my chart and compass. Your verbal directions I shall be likely to forget when I most need them. The polestar, which you tell me may be my guide, is often for a long time concealed by impenetrable clouds. There are fearful maelstroms, near the verge of whose deceptive and destructive circles my course lies, and ere I am aware of it I shall have passed the fatal line, from which no voyager returns. Between me and my desired haven there is a "hell-gate," where are sunken rocks and conflicting currents, and amid all these complicated dangers my frail bark will make shipwreck, without my chart and compass. Deprived of these, I cannot keep my reckoning, I cannot shape my course, I cannot find my haven.

I need not tell you, my dear brother, that it is a part of the slaveholding policy to take from thousands and millions of immortal beings in our nominally Christian land, this precious chart and compass,—the Bible, the only safe guide to heaven. I have often heard you speak of it,

and deplore it. Those severe laws which forbid teaching the slave to read, do virtually take from him the Bible, — his directory to the New Jerusalem. You may, indeed, give him oral instruction, and in many instances, no doubt, they are blessed to his conversion; but how utterly inadequate are they to his spiritual wants, how imperfect are they at best, and in how many thousands of cases are even these entirely wanting. Every enlightened and intelligent Christian knows, from his own experience, how hard it is to enter the “strait gate,” and to keep in the “narrow way,” and how needful to him are all the helps within his reach, and then he is but “scarcely saved.” What hope is there, then, for the poor slave, who is deprived, not only of most of the ordinary and extraordinary means of grace which we enjoy, but is forbidden the printed Word of God? Is not a fearful responsibility incurred by those who, for any reason, stand between God and his children, and intercept those messages of grace and mercy which are contained in the Holy Scriptures?

That noble institution, the American Bible Society, is multiplying copies of the sacred Word by thousands and hundreds of thousands, and scattering them over the land and the world; it hesitates not to thrust them into the hands of the fol-

lowers of the false prophet, — the deluded followers of the man of sin, — the disciples of Confucius and Zoroaster, — the worshippers of Jugger-naut and Vishnoo, and the degraded inhabitants of the South Seas and Caffraria; — it benevolently resolves to put a copy of the Bible into the dwelling of every white family in these United States; but it is obliged by law to pass by the cabin of the slave, and leave more than three millions of immortal beings to find the road to heaven the best way they can.

My brother, I cannot think of these things without the deepest grief, and I know that you fully sympathize with me; but it is some consolation to believe that the great mass of evangelical Christians take the same views of the wrongs inflicted upon the slave that we do, for it is to the Christian sentiment of this country that we must look for the removal of them.

Our brethren of the Presbyterian church have borne their testimony most fully and pointedly against the evils of slavery which we have been considering. You doubtless recollect the action of the General Assembly on this subject in 1818. A committee was appointed, to whom was referred certain resolutions on the subject of selling a slave, — a member of the church, — and which was directed to prepare a report to be adopted

by the Assembly, expressing their opinion in general on the subject of slavery. The report of this committee was unanimously adopted, and ordered to be published. It is, in part, as follows:—

“The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, having taken into consideration the subject of slavery, think proper to make known their sentiments upon it to the churches.

“We consider the voluntary enslaving of the one part of the human race by another, as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature; as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbors as ourselves; and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the gospel of Christ, which enjoins that all things ‘whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.’ Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system; it exhibits rational, accountable, and immortal beings in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of others, whether they shall receive religious instruction; whether they shall know and worship the true God; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the gospel; whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endear-



ments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbors and friends; whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity.

“Such are some of the consequences of slavery, — consequences, not imaginary, but which connect themselves with its very existence. The evils to which the slave is always exposed often take place in fact, and in their very worst degree and form, and where all of them do not take place, as we rejoice to say that in many instances, through the influence of the principles of humanity and religion on the minds of masters, they do not, still the slave is deprived of his natural right, degraded as a human being, and exposed to the danger of passing into the hands of a master who may inflict upon him all the hardships which inhumanity and avarice may suggest.”

An Address from the Synod of Kentucky, in 1835, to the Presbyterians of that State, is much more specific in its delineations of the evils of slavery, and in its denunciations of the system, and adopts language far more severe than many northern Christians would think it expedient to use. It presents a picture of its actual workings which could be drawn only by one who had seen the original. If you have not read this address, I beg that you will do so. It is altogether a

southern document. I have room only for a short extract.

Slavery is characterized as “a demoralizing and cruel system, which it would be an insult to God to imagine that he does not abhor; a system which exhibits power without responsibility, toil without recompense, life without liberty, law without justice, wrongs without redress, infamy without crime, punishment without guilt, and families without marriage; a system which will not only make victims of the present unhappy generation, inflicting upon them the degradation, the contempt, the lassitude, and the anguish of hopeless oppression; but which even aims at transmitting this heritage of injury and woe to their children and their children’s children, down to their latest posterity. Can any Christian contemplate, without trembling, his own agency in the perpetuation of such a system?”

Coincident with the judgment of these two most respectable and revered ecclesiastical bodies is the testimony of one of the most prominent and honored sons of the southern church, the Rev. Dr. R. L. Breckenridge. Says he:—

“What then is slavery? for the question relates to the action of certain principles of it, and to its probable and proper results; what is slavery as it

exists among us ? We reply, it is that condition enforced by the laws of one half of the States of this confederacy, in which one portion of the community, called masters, are allowed such power over another portion called slaves, as —

“1. To deprive them of the entire earnings of their own labor, except so much as is necessary to continue labor itself by continuing healthful existence : thus committing clear robbery.

“2. To reduce them to the necessity of universal concubinage, by denying to them the civil rights of marriage, thus breaking up the dearest relations of life, and encouraging universal prostitution.

“3. To deprive them of the means and opportunities of moral and intellectual culture, in many States making it a high penal offence to teach them to read, thus perpetuating whatever of evil there is that proceeds from ignorance.

“4. To set up between parents and their children an authority higher than the impulse of nature and the laws of God, which breaks up the authority of the father over his own offspring, and at pleasure separates the mother at a returnless distance from her child, thus abrogating the clearest laws of nature, thus outraging all decency and justice, and degrading and oppressing thou-

sands upon thousands of beings, created like themselves in the image of the most high God! This is slavery as it is daily exhibited in every slave State."

Yes, such is the nature and character of an institution in this enlightened Christian republic, claiming to be the freest nation on earth, calling itself "an asylum for the oppressed," inviting the downtrodden subjects of all the despots of the old world to come to this happy land, and place themselves under the protection of the American eagle, and in this "eyrie of the free" taste and enjoy the sweets of liberty!

The views presented in the above extracts may be taken, it is to be presumed, as an exponent of the southern Christian sentiment on domestic slavery. There are, indeed, exceptions. It is painful to notice that within a few years some men of reputed piety and worth have been attempting to maintain that American slavery is a "divine and patriarchal institution," "sanctioned by the Bible," — is "necessary to the highest state of society," and is "to be perpetuated;" but I am happy to believe that the number of those who hold such views, repudiating those of the Presbyterian church, and at the same time call themselves disciples of Him who said, "what-

soever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," is comparatively small.

I close this long letter by subscribing myself, as ever,

Your affectionate

Friend and Brother.



## LETTER VIII.

THREE QUESTIONS SUGGESTED. — 1. MUST SLAVERY BE PERPETUAL? — 2. DOES THE CHURCH OF CHRIST SUSTAIN ANY RESPONSIBILITY IN THIS MATTER? — 3. WHAT SHALL WE DO?

MY DEAR CHRISTIAN FRIEND, — I fear I shall make myself tedious to you by dwelling so long upon this; to me, painful subject, — slavery. I will, therefore, in the present letter, finish what I have to say for the present, hoping that our future correspondence may be on more grateful themes.

There are a few questions which are suggested to us by the brief view we have taken of this most important subject. The first is, Must slavery, with all its attendant evils, be perpetuated? Must this blot rest upon our beloved country, and tarnish its escutcheon forever? I am persuaded that the spontaneous answer from the Christian heart of this nation is, *No!* It was never contemplated by Washington nor Jefferson nor Adams, nor by the framers of our Constitution, nor by the great mass of noble patriots who

perilled their all for the independence of their country, that slavery was to be handed down to posterity. If you will look at the writings of the leading public men of the last century, you will find, that, almost without exception, they looked upon slavery in the United States as a temporary evil, to be removed as soon as circumstances would permit. They regarded it not only a wrong inflicted upon the slave, but an incubus upon the nation, soon to pass away.

The great body of Christians in our land have been looking forward to the time, and praying for its arrival, when all the oppressed within our borders shall go free. That the time will come when slavery shall cease in our land, I as fully believe as I believe that there is a God who presides over and directs the destinies of men. You and I may not live to see the day; but it will come.

Another question suggested is, Does the church of Christ in this country sustain any responsibility in regard to slavery, and has she any duty to discharge in relation to it? By the church of Christ, I mean the great mass of Christians of every name who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, both North and South.

This question is easily answered. There are no evils existing in the Christian's field of labor—

the world — in regard to which he has not some responsibility, and for the removal of which he is not bound to do something. As a general truth, the nearer the evils come to our own firesides and bosoms, the weightier those responsibilities become. The hundreds of millions of heathens in foreign lands lying in sin and degradation appeal to our sympathy and efforts, and that appeal we may not disregard. But the heathen in our own land have on us much stronger claims, and our obligations to put forth efforts in their behalf are more imperious.

Slavery is a great evil and sin, which affects not only individuals, but our country; and, both as Christians and patriots, we ought to be sensibly alive to every thing that affects our common weal. You who live at the South, it may be, have more responsibility in this matter than we at the North; but none of us can say, “because I am not personally implicated in inflicting wrongs upon the slave, therefore I have nothing to do for their removal.” Should this become the universal sentiment of the church, Satan’s kingdom in our world would never come to an end, and wickedness would prevail forever. The spirit of Christianity, although preëminently mild, gentle, patient, and long-suffering, is nevertheless, in an important

sense, aggressive. It has ever claimed the right of interesting itself in the welfare of every human creature — to exert its influence to check the progress of sin in every form — to attack error in principle and in practice — to “loose the bands of wickedness,” — “undo heavy burdens,” — “break every yoke,” — “deliver the poor and needy,” — and to “remember them that are in bonds as bound with them.” This, by some, may be called officiousness, but we cannot help it; it is a part of the Christian’s legitimate business to volunteer his influence and his services (in every proper way) in opposing wrong, and to stand up and plead the cause of those who suffer it the world over. He cannot refrain from doing so, without proving himself false to his Master and his Master’s cause.

Admitting, then, that all Christians have some kind of responsibility and duty devolving on them, a most important question — comes up. Thirdly, what shall they do? There are certainly some things which it is perfectly evident we should not do, — though we should rebuke this and every sin, we should not give vent to our hatred of the system in ebullitions of wrath, invective, and abuse toward slaveholders. Thus did not

Christ nor his apostles. This is not in accordance with the Christian spirit, and could be productive only of evil.

Neither should we endeavor to exert an influence over the slaves to make them restive and disobedient; none but an enemy to the true interests, both of the slave and his country, would do that, unless under some hallucination.

Neither should we interfere politically with slavery beyond the boundaries of our own State, in States where it now exists by the laws of the land. I might go on indefinitely, and specify what we should not do; but this does not meet the case; — what shall we do? It would be arrogance in me to attempt a full answer to a question that has engaged the attention of many abler heads and better hearts than mine, but there are some things which have already been said by others, that cannot be too frequently repeated.

In the first place, we can commit this whole matter to God in humble, earnest prayer. Here is something which we can all do, North and South, and in which we shall all be agreed. However much we may differ in regard to the safety and expediency of other measures to moderate the condition of the slave and bring about his ultimate emancipation, we are of one mind in regard to the safety and efficacy of



prayer. One effect of this will be to unite our own hearts more closely in sympathy and love. There will be no danger of calling each other hard names, bandying unchristian epithets, and biting and devouring one another, if we are in the habit of meeting daily at the throne of grace to pray for a cause in which we take a mutual interest.

By prayer we may hope to be enlightened more fully in regard to our duty. "If any man lack wisdom," and surely we all do on this subject, "let him ask of God."

In answer to prayer, we have reason to hope that God will open the eyes to teach the hearts of all slaveholders, and lead them to "do justly and love mercy," and also that he will, in his holy and wise Providence, redress the wrongs of his oppressed children, and prepare the way for their ultimate emancipation.

Prayer is the Christian's first and last resort. Let us, then, my dear brother, pray over this subject continuously, and with an earnestness commensurate with its importance, and then, I doubt not, we shall ourselves be more enlightened than we now are as to our future course.

A second duty, hardly less obvious than prayer, is to use all the influence we possess to prevent the extension of the domain of slavery. To this

end, we should utter our voices long and loud in remonstrance against any such measure. If we and our legislators may not politically interfere with slavery in States where it now exists, we may interfere to prevent it from exerting its baleful influence over territory now free. We should do many things for the sake of peace and conciliation. We have heretofore made concessions and compromises — perhaps too many — on this subject; but here is where the people of God, North and South, should make a stand, and declare before heaven and earth, and with an emphasis which cannot be misunderstood, that not another inch of our public domain shall be cursed with slavery for any consideration whatever, if our influence can prevent it. In our remonstrances, we will be respectful, but firm. Let our politicians know that all persons who are governed by Christian principle, through the length and breadth of the land, have taken their position, and that the mountains shall be removed out of their places, ere they will swerve from it, and there will be but little danger of slave extension.

In the third place, we should use every endeavor to disseminate the gospel of Christ, and bring its principles to bear upon all classes of persons, North and South. If we can do this

effectually, it is all sufficient. The Gospel, if faithfully applied, is a sure remedy for every social and moral evil that ever existed. We at the North should demonstrate to our slaveholding friends whom we wish to influence, that we ourselves are governed by its spirit, and actuated by its principle, in all that we do in relation to this subject. It is not ambition, a lust for power, sectional jealousy, a spirit of censoriousness or ill-will, that prompts us to what they have been in the habit of regarding as intermeddling with their affairs, in which we have no concern, but a spirit of love,—love not less to them than to their slaves. And then, in the temper of Christ, we will bring the Gospel to bear on the slaveholder's conscience and sense of justice. We will hold up and keep before his mind the great rule of life given by Him who spake as never man spake,—“Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them.” Let this rule be once adopted and carried out, and it is enough. Human beings would no more be sold as beasts in the market, and driven to unrequited toil; the minds of men would no longer be kept in ignorance; the domestic circle would never again be invaded by the hand of sordid avarice separating husbands and wives, parents and children, doing savage violence

to the noblest affections of our nature; the Bible would be put into the hands of every slave, and he would be taught to read it; common schools and Sabbath schools would be everywhere established and maintained, as well for the slave as for the white child; the master would regard those whom he now holds as property as his own brethren, going with him to the same judgment, and destined finally to dwell with him as his equals, in the same heaven, and to wear as bright crowns and sing as rapturous a song as he. He would immediately set himself about preparing his slaves for emancipation, and for the enjoyment of those natural rights, of which they have for so long a time been most unjustly deprived. In short, slavery, as the term is now understood, would cease instantly, and a kind, parental guardianship would take its place, and every southern plantation would be transformed into a moral garden of beauty and happiness, and universal and entire emancipation would follow with the least possible delay. And, finally, we should if possible bring the Gospel to bear upon the great body politic, upon our presidents, our governors, our National and State legislators. It would seem that some of our law-makers are much better acquainted with Blackstone and Vattel, than they are with the Lord

Jesus Christ, or they would not disgrace our statute-books with laws which ignore the "higher laws" of God. We should often remind them that this is a Christian, and not a heathen or infidel republic; and that every enactment, not consistent with the gospel of Christ and inalienable human rights, does violence to the Christian sentiment and Christian conscience of the nation, and must be repealed. If they will not hear us, we have only to appoint more faithful servants, who will do as they are told. We have no idea of "uniting church and state," but to infuse as much of the Gospel into the state as possible is both a privilege and duty; and when all our affairs and institutions, public, domestic, and private, are administered on gospel principles, we shall become a free, prosperous, and happy people, and not till then.

And now, may God bless you, my dear brother, and guide you, and guide us all, to pursue such a course in regard to the three and a half millions of slaves in our professedly free republic as will afford us the most satisfaction when we meet them as our equals at the judgment-seat of Christ.

With high esteem and much affection,

I remain your Christian brother,

A. C. BALDWIN.



# AN ESSAY,

BY

REV. TIMOTHY WILLISTON.

IS AMERICAN SLAVERY AN INSTITUTION WHICH CHRISTIANITY  
SANCTIONS, AND WILL PERPETUATE? AND, IN VIEW  
OF THIS SUBJECT, WHAT OUGHT AMERICAN  
CHRISTIANS TO DO, AND REFRAIN  
FROM DOING ?

---

Homo sum ; humani nihil a me alienum puto. — TERENCE.

Bear ye one another's burdens. — PAUL.

(99)



## ESSAY.

---

A GREAT moral question is, in this nineteenth century, being tried before the church of Christ, and at the bar of public sentiment. It is, Whether the system of servitude known as American slavery be a system whose perpetuity is compatible with pure Christianity? Whether, with the Bible in her hand, the church may lawfully indorse, participate in, and help perpetuate, this system? Or whether, on the other hand, the system be, in its origin, nature, and workings, intrinsically evil; a thing which, if, like concubinage and polygamy, God has indeed tolerated in his church, he never approved of; and which, in the progress of a pure Christianity, must inevitably become extinct? I feel assured that the latter of these propositions will, without argument, command the assent of the mass of living

Christians. But there are those in the church who array themselves on the other side. While they would not justify the least inhumanity in the treatment of slaves, they profess to believe that slavery itself has the approbation of Jehovah, and may with propriety be perpetuated in the church and the world. At their hands I would respectfully solicit a patient hearing, while I proceed to assign several reasons for differing with them in opinion.

First. Slavery is a condition of society not founded in nature. When God, in his Word, demands that children shall be in subordination to their parents, and citizens to the constituted civil authorities, we need no why and wherefore to enable us to see the reasonableness of these requirements. We feel that they are no arbitrary enactments, but indispensable to the best interests of families and of society, and therefore founded in nature. We are prepared, too, from their obvious necessity and utility, to rank them among the permanent statutes of the Divine Legislator. But can as much be said of slavery? Is there such an obvious fitness and utility in one man's being, against his will, owned and controlled by another, as to prepare us to say that such an ownership is founded in the very constitution of things? None will pretend that

there is. Not only is slavery not founded in nature, but,

Second. It is condemned by the very instincts of our moral constitution. These instincts seem to whisper that "all men are born free and equal;" equal, not in intellect, or in the petty distinctions of parentage, property, or power; but having, as the creatures of one God, an equal right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Job's moral instincts taught him, that the fact of all men's having one and the same Creator gave his servants a right to contend with him, when wronged; and that, if he "despised their cause," he must answer it to his God and theirs. That men of all races and grades are essentially equal before God; that every man has a right to himself, to the fruits of his toil, and to the unmolested pursuit of happiness, in all lawful ways; and hence, that slavery, as existing in these States, is a gigantic system of evil and wrong,—are truths which the moral sense of men is everywhere proclaiming with much emphasis and distinctness. If it be not so, what means this note of remonstrance, long and loud, that comes to our ears over the Atlantic wave? Why else did a Mohammedan prince,\* (to say nothing of what nearly all Chris-

\* Mehemet Ali.



tian governments have done,) put an end to slavery in his dominions before he died? And how else shall we account for that moral earthquake which has for years been rocking this great republic to its very centre? One cannot thoughtfully observe the signs of the times,—no, nor the workings of his own heart, methinks,—without perceiving that slavery is at war with the moral sense of mankind. If there be any conscience that approves, it must be a conscience perverted by wrong instruction, or by a vicious practice. And can that be a good institution, and worthy of perpetuity, which an unperverted conscience instinctively condemns?

Third. The bad character of slavery becomes yet more apparent, if we consider the manner in which it has chiefly originated and been sustained. Did God institute the relation of master and slave, as he did the conjugal and parental relations? It is not pretended. In what, then, did slavery have its beginning? Doubtless the first slaves were captives, taken in war. In primitive ages, the victors in war were considered as having a right to do what they pleased with their captives; and so it sometimes happened that they were put to death, and sometimes that they were made to serve their captors as bondmen. Thus slavery was at first the incidental result of war.

But as time rolled on, the love of power and of gain prompted men to make aggressions on their weaker neighbors, for the very purpose of enslaving them ; and, eventually, man-stealing and the slave-trade became familiar facts in the world's history. Upon these has slavery, for centuries past, depended mainly for its continuance. And, although these feeders of slavery are now by Christian nations branded as piracy and strictly vetoed, they are far from being exterminated. Indeed, it seems to be well understood, that, if all commerce in slaves, foreign and domestic, ceases, slavery itself must soon become extinct.

Now if man-stealing be an act which the Word of God and the moral instincts of men do most pointedly condemn, — and I will attempt no demonstration of this here, — what shall we say of that which is its legitimate offspring and dependant? Far be it from me to affirm, that, circumstanced as our southern brethren are, it is just as criminal for them to hold slaves as it would be to go now to Africa and forcibly seize them. But, in the spirit of love, I would ask my slaveholding brother, Can that be a justifiable institution, and deserving to be upheld, which has so bad a parentage? “Do men gather grapes of thorns?” “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?”

Fourth. There are, in the Scriptures, many clear indications that slavery has not the approbation of God, and hence has not the stamp of perpetuity upon it. Under this head, let us notice several distinct particulars.

1. Had God regarded servitude as a good thing, he would not, in authoritatively predicting its existence, have said, "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." What God visits men with as a curse cannot be intrinsically good and beneficial.

2. The judgments with which God visited Egypt and her proud monarch, for refusing to emancipate the Israelites, and for essaying to recapture them, when let go, and the wages which he caused his people, when released, to receive for their hitherto unrequited toils, clearly evince that he has no complacency in compulsory, unrewarded servitude.

3. The same thing is indicated by the fact that God has, by statute, provided expressly for the protection and freedom of an escaped slave; but not for the recovery of such a fugitive by his master. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place which he shall choose. . . . Thou shalt not oppress him."

Now be it, if you will, that this statute had reference only to servants who should escape into the land of Israel from Gentile masters ; does it not indicate a strong bias, in the mind of God, to the side of freedom, rather than that of slavery ? And does it not establish the point, that, in God's estimation, one man cannot rightfully be deemed the property of another man ? Were it otherwise, would not the Jew have been required to restore a runaway to his pursuing master, just as he was to restore any other lost thing which its owner should come in search of ? Or, to say the least, would not the Israelites have been allowed to reduce to servitude among themselves the escaped slave of a heathen master ? But how unlike all this are the actual requirements of the statute. God's people must neither deliver up the fugitive nor enslave him themselves ; but allow him to dwell among them as a FREEMAN, just "where it liketh him best." And, in this connection, how significant a fact is it, that the Bible nowhere empowers the master from whom a slave had escaped to pursue, seize, and drag back to bondage that escaped slave.

4. That which constitutes the grand fountain of slavery, — the forcible, stealthy seizure of a man, for the purpose of holding or selling him as a slave, — was, under the Mosaic dispensation,

- punishable with death ; and is, in the New Testament, named in connection with the most heinous crimes. "He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." What could more forcibly exhibit God's disapprobation of one of the distinctive features of slavery, — compulsion ? What more impressively show the value that he puts upon a man's personal independence, — his right to himself ? Now if God doomed that man to die a felon's death who should steal and sell a fellow man, can it be that he would hold him guiltless who should buy the stolen man, knowing him to have been stolen ? God's people were, indeed, allowed to "buy bondmen and bondmaids" of the strangers that dwelt among them, and of the surrounding heathen. But were they ever allowed to buy persons whom they knew to have been unlawfully obtained, and offered for sale in manifest opposition to their own wishes ? If they were not, — and, from the statute just referred to, it seems certain that they were not, — does American slavery derive countenance from that which was tolerated in the Jewish church and nation ? True, the slaves now held as such among us were not themselves feloniously seized on a foreign soil, torn away from kindred, homes, and country, and sold into hopeless bondage in a



strange land ; but their sires and grandsires were. Man-stealing is confessedly the stock out of which has sprung, and grown to its present dimensions, the vast and overshadowing Upas of American slavery ; and if the Bible brands that stock as pestiferous, must not the entire tree partake of the noxious influence ? Again : if, as competent critics assert, the popular sense of the word rendered “men-stealers,” in 1 Tim. i. 10, be “those who deal in men—literally, slave-traders,” then trafficking in slaves for mercenary ends is, by Paul, ranked among vices the most abominable ; and American slavery is, if possible, more pointedly condemned by that passage than by the statute found in Ex. xxi. 16. For who does not know that trading in “the persons of men” has ever been, and yet is, a main pillar in the fabric of slavery ? Indeed, man-stealing and slave-trading are to slave-holding precisely what the business of the distiller and of the vendor is to the vice of intemperance. There is, in either case, a trio of associated evils ; and it is difficult to say which member of either trio is the most repulsive and harmful.

If, now, it be objected to this argument from the Bible, that the Mosaic institutes expressly recognize such a thing as involuntary servitude, and prescribe rules for its regulation, I answer :

true, but the servitude thus recognized and regulated by statute was of a far milder type than that which is legalized in these American States. For, 1. It allowed the bondman a large amount of leisure, or time which he need not devote to his master's service; 2. It made it possible for him to accumulate a considerable amount of property; 3. It placed him on a perfect level with his master, in regard to religious privileges; 4. It gave him his freedom whenever he should be so chastised as to result in permanent injury to his person: thus operating as a powerful preventive of inhumanity in chastising; 5. It respected the sanctity of the conjugal and parental relations, when existing among bondmen, and did not authorize a compulsory severing of family ties; 6. It made no provision for the sale of a servant by his Jewish master, nor for any such domestic commerce in the persons of men as is practised in the southern States of this Union; 7. It provided for the periodical emancipation of all that were in bondage; thus aiming a fatal blow at the very existence of servitude in the Hebrew commonwealth. I may not, consistently with the necessary brevity of a tract designed for popular perusal, go into any demonstration of the facts above asserted. For proof that they are facts, let my readers studiously examine

the Mosaic books, and the Rev. A. Barnes's "Inquiry into the Scriptural Views of Slavery." I see not how any candid and discriminating investigator can help being convinced that the servitude which was temporarily tolerated in the Jewish church, was, in numerous respects, very unlike to that which exists among us, and far less repulsive.

But suppose, for argument's sake, it had been just as repulsive a system as ours, would the fact of its having been tolerated under the Jewish economy prove it to be intrinsically good, and worthy of being perpetuated? Then, by parity of reasoning, the good men of ancient times might safely have concluded that certain other practices were good and would endure, which we know were not good, and were not to last. Had the question been propounded in Abraham's or in David's day, whether polygamy and concubinage were approved of God, and would be perpetuated in the church, it is probable that even the saints of those periods would have responded affirmatively. The fact that God had so long allowed his people to practise these things unrebuked, might, to them, have seemed sufficient proof that these practices were intrinsically proper, and were to rank among the permanent fixtures of human society. But were Abraham

and David now on the earth, with what changed feelings would they regard the cast-off system of concubinage and a plurality of wives. Again: suppose the conjecture had been hazarded, three thousand years ago, that woman, from being a menial drudge, or a mere medium of bestial indulgence, would one day occupy the dignified position to which Christianity has actually lifted her, would not incredulity have lurked in every heart, and found expression on every tongue? Now there are plain indications, not only in the Word, but the providences of God, that he never regarded slavery with complacency, any more than he did polygamy, concubinage, or the serfdom of woman; and that he never designed its perpetuity. Scrutinizing that Word and those providences, one needs no prophetic ken to enable him to predict with certainty, that, when Christ's millennial reign is ushered in, contraband will be inscribed on slavery, as it already has been on some other evils that were once tolerated, not only in society, but in the church of God.

But I shall be reminded here, that, when the apostles were disseminating Christianity in the Roman empire, there prevailed throughout that empire a system of slavery more odious and oppressive than ours; and yet that both slaveholders and slaves were converted and admitted

to the church, without its affecting the relation of master and slave; that the New Testament instructs the parties how to demean themselves in that relation, but nowhere enjoins emancipation on the master, or encourages absconding or non-submission in the slave; in short, that it nowhere expressly condemns slavery, or intimates that its extermination was to be expected or desired. In reply to this, I would say,—

(1.) To infer, because the New Testament enjoins obedience on slaves, and makes no direct attack on the institution of slavery, that it therefore sanctions the institution, and would have it perpetuated, is as much a *non sequitur* as to infer, because God enjoins on men subjection to existing civil authorities, whatever may be their character, that he as much approves of a despotic as of a constitutional government,—of the government of Ferdinand of Naples as of that of Victoria of England. Nor is it more difficult to comprehend why God has, in the Scriptures, made no direct assault on slavery, than it is to see why He has not directly assailed governmental despotisms, or expressed any preference for one form of government over another. An obvious and far-seeing wisdom is discernible in this, which it behooves us to admire, and not unfrequently to imitate. Had the apostles or



the Scriptures openly denounced all absolutism, whether civil or domestic, it would have aroused unnecessary prejudice and opposition, and diverted the attention of men from the grand object aimed at in giving the world a written and preached gospel. God deemed it wiser to reach these evils through the slow but sure progress of certain great principles laid down in his Word, than through the medium of specific prohibitions.

(2.) The fact that the apostles received into the church converts who not only held slaves, but held them under a slave-system that was awfully despotic, was no indorsement on their part of that odious system, nor even of the slightest inhumanity on the part of a master towards his slaves. It does, indeed, prove that a man may be a Christian, without ceasing to be a slaveholder in form; but not that a master may indulge in all the legal barbarities of the system, and yet be a Christian. Merely to sustain the relation of a Christian master for the good of the slave, or from the necessity of the case, is one thing, while to advocate and defend this chattel system, and hold in bondage fellow human beings for personal and selfish ends, is quite another thing. Nowhere do the Scriptures countenance, or even wink at, the least degree

of inhumanity or injustice in the treatment of servants. So far from this, they expressly enjoin it on masters to "give unto their servants that which is just and equal," all the law of disinterested love would require; accompanying the injunction with the significant hint, that they themselves have a Master, and that with him there is "no respect of persons."

(3.) Though the Scriptures do not directly assail the system of slavery, they indirectly and obviously condemn it, and that very abundantly. Slavery is indirectly and yet strongly rebuked in such passages of Scripture as the following: "Wo unto him that . . . . useth his neighbor's service without wages." "Is not this the fast that I have chosen, . . . . to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?" "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy?" . . . . "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?" . . . . "And hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth; . . . . that they should seek the Lord." . . . . "God is no respecter of persons." "The people of the land have used oppression, . . . . therefore have I poured out mine indignation upon them." . . . . "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

“Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.” It needs no unusual acuteness to see, that, were the spirit of these and kindred passages (for numerous others of the sort might have been cited) everywhere acted out, slavery would as readily vanish, as do the icebergs of the North, if perchance they float away into milder latitudes.

Fifth. To the four reasons already assigned for thinking that slavery has not God’s approbation, and ought not to be perpetuated, I will add but — one more,—its baleful effects. (1). As it respects worldly thrift, or pecuniary prosperity. It is a fact, that slavery exerts a depressing influence on the business welfare of any community where it prevails; and that, other things being equal, slaveholding States can never compete with free ones in the item of financial prosperity. A necessary brevity forbids my pointing out the causes of this fact; but my readers will, without my aid, readily ascertain what they are. Suffice it to say, it has become a settled maxim of political economy, that there exists an antagonism between slavery and the highest business prosperity of any people that tolerates it; and the southern States of this Union furnish abundant confirmation of its truth. (2.) I will name but one other thing,—its

baneful influence on character and morals. That slavery tends to debase the character and morals of the slaves will scarcely be questioned. Apart from the ignorance naturally resulting from their condition, that condition powerfully tends to render them sensual, indolent, artful, mendacious, stealthful, and revengeful. But is the bad moral tendency of the institution limited to the bondmen? Exerts it no corrupting influence on the hearts, the habits, and morals of the masters? Is it not its legitimate tendency to foster in them such vices as indolence, effeminacy, licentiousness, covetousness, inhumanity, haughtiness, and a supreme regard for self? Of course, I do not affirm that it uniformly produces these sad effects on the character of masters. So far from this, there may doubtless be found slaveholders, who, in all that adorns and ennobles human character, will compare favorably with the very best men at the North. I think it will be conceded, however, that the legitimate tendency is to evil, and that the effects of slavery on the character of its sustainers are, in the main, disastrous; and that the depreciated state of morals prevailing where slavery exists is mainly attributable to this as its source. I need not here enter into detail. Facts are too well known to make this necessary.

Thus have we contemplated several distinct reasons for believing that slavery is no good thing,—has not the sanction of Jehovah,—and cannot with propriety be perpetuated. Its contrariety to nature,—its antagonism to the moral sense of mankind,—its disgraceful parentage and manner of support,—its condemnation by the Bible,—and its disastrous influence on financial prosperity, on character, and on public morals,—all proclaim that slavery, so far from being a good thing, is a tremendous curse; yea, more, that it is a stupendous wrong; and hence, that it should be tolerated in the church of Christ no longer than the best interests of all concerned may render necessary for a safe termination.

But it may be, after all, that I have failed to secure the assent of some of my southern brethren to the justness of the foregoing positions and inferences. It may be that they still regard the system of bondage prevailing in their midst as in the main beneficial, defensible from the Bible, and, with some modifications perhaps, worthy of perpetuity. Well, brethren, suppose you do thus regard it; and for argument's sake suppose, too, that you may possibly be right,—that slave-holding may be in itself the harmless thing which you deem it; ought you not cheer-



fully to abandon it, in obedience to a great Bible principle, — that of refraining from things which are in themselves lawful, or which your conscience may not condemn, out of regard to the conscience of aggrieved Christian brethren, or to the prejudices of those whose salvation you would not obstruct? You are aware, brethren, that this magnanimous principle Paul both inculcated and exemplified. You are also aware that a large majority of the Christians now living regard your cherished institution as unjustifiable, and at variance with the spirit of Christianity; and, so regarding it, they long for its extinction, and are grieved with you for cleaving to it so tenaciously, and refusing to concert measures for its ultimate overthrow. Indeed, they are more than grieved; they are profoundly agitated by the fresh developments of the iniquitous system which you are helping to uphold; and there seems no prospect, while that system endures, of their becoming tranquillized. A tempest has sprung up and is raging in the church of Christ, — to say nothing of the civilized world, — which seems not likely to cease till its cause be removed; and slavery is that cause. Now I put it to you, brethren, if here be not an opportunity of exemplifying, on a broad scale, the self-denying and noble principle which Paul

indicates in the words, "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient;" "Eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience' sake: . . . conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other;" "Though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more." Have it, if you will, that the brethren for whose sake you are asked to make this sacrifice are weak brethren, and their consciences weak. Your obligation to make it is none the less on that account; for the principle just adverted to contemplates cases of this very sort. Since the practice which grieves these weak brethren is one that you can probably abandon without wounding your own conscience, are you at liberty to undervalue their conscience by persisting in that which grieves them?

But how much weightier does this argument become, when it is remembered that the opposers of slavery, besides being exceedingly numerous, have, many of them, been eminent,—not merely for a conscientious piety, but for talent, for research, for scholarship, for broad and comprehensive views of things;—and that the list embraces distinguished southern, as well as northern men; and men of celebrity in both church and state. There have been found

in the anti-slavery ranks, presidents and noble men, jurists and legislators, statesmen and divines, scholars and authors, poets and orators. And, still further to enhance the dignity of the cause, it should be remembered that several General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, together with numerous lesser ecclesiastical bodies, have lifted up their voice in opposition to slavery, and proclaimed substantially the same views which this humble Essay has aimed to exhibit. Now if, as we have seen, a deferential regard should be had to the conscience of aggrieved Christian brethren, even when they are few and feeble-minded, how much more, when the aggrieved ones are counted in hundreds of thousands? when theirs is an intelligent piety and an enlightened conscience? and when, too, their remonstrance is backed up by a public sentiment that is wellnigh unanimous through all christendom?

If now, in spite of all these considerations, I still have readers that say in their hearts, slavery must be perpetuated, they will pardon me for lingering no longer in the hope of changing their views. I would be indulged, however, in one parting interrogation. Has it never occurred to you, brethren, that yours is, on some accounts, a very unfavorable stand-point from which to

form just and disinterested views of slavery ; and that your very position as slave-holders, and your long familiarity with the system and its evils, may have blinded you to the magnitude of those evils, and to the great desirableness of their being removed ? May it not be that long use, and self-interest, and the love of power and ease, have conspired to warp your judgment, blunt your sensibilities, and cause you to view slavery through a deceptive medium ?

Having, as I hope, the cordial assent of the great mass of my readers, northern and southern, to the foregoing argument against slavery and its perpetuity, we are now prepared to advance to the last great division of our subject, and to inquire : What are the duties, positive and negative, which this subject imposes on American Christians ? What does it demand that we, as Christians, should do, and refrain from doing ? This question subdivides itself thus : What ought we northern and professedly anti-slavery Christians to do, and not do ? And, next, What duties, positive and negative, does the question devolve on professing Christians in the slaveholding States ?

I. We are to consider what we, the northern and avowedly anti-slavery section of the American church, ought, in view of this subject, both

to do, and refrain from doing. In reply to the question, What ought we to do? I would say,—

1. It is not only our right, but duty, temperately and with Christian courtesy to continue to discuss this great theme, both orally and with the pen; and especially to endeavor to bring the truth into contact with the mind and heart of our southern brethren,—if, peradventure, we may thus persuade them soon to cease their connection with slavery. Freedom of discussion is one important safeguard of the public weal; and that must be regarded as a bad, untenable cause which will not bear the test of a full and free discussion before the world. Free inquiry, too, has not only preceded all great reformatations, but has been an important instrument in bringing them about. That great moral change known as the temperance reformation is but one example among many that might be adduced. If slavery is ever to be numbered in history among the things that are past, it will be by having Bible light and truth made to converge upon it, through the lens of free public discussion. Hence, believing as we do that American slavery is an enormous evil and a gigantic wrong,—a thing with which the church should cease to have connection as speedily as may be,—as Christians we may, we must, employ our tongues and our



pens in behalf of the enslaved, till our world shall cease to contain such a class of men.

2. We ought so to exercise the right of suffrage as to resist the extension of slavery beyond its present limits. I say nothing here of the political question of State rights, or of interfering with slavery in States where it now exists. The question of authorizing by law the extension of slavery into new States and Territories, or of admitting new States with pro-slavery constitutions, is another and very different thing from that of disturbing the compact in relation to slavery entered into by the founders of this republic. The concessions in relation to the slave interest which our fathers made by no means oblige us to make further concessions, by consenting that slavery shall overstep her present geographical limits. I know not what others may think; but, for one, I feel constrained, by a sense of duty to God and my country, so to vote as to have my votes tell against the spread of slavery. I must carry my Christian principles of love and humanity to the ballot-box, as well as elsewhere. Though long identified with one of the political parties, I have of late felt myself bound, as a voter, to ignore the ancient party lines, and even to ignore all other questions, compared with the one great and absorbing one, Shall slavery be

allowed to have more territory, in which to breed and expand itself? In my deliberate judgment, all Christian patriots should, so far as their votes can speak, say to the system of bondage existing in our midst, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." This becomes now a moral and a religious duty.

(3.) In our visits to the throne of grace, we ought, with more frequency and fervor, "to remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them." Assured that all hearts and events are at God's disposal, that he abhors oppression, and that prayer is the Christian's mode of taking hold of God's strength, we must make full proof of this as a weapon with which to effect the subversion of slavery. It may be that importunate, persevering prayer will effect more in behalf of the enslaved than all other instrumentalities. It is, at least, quite certain that other means will prove inefficacious, if this be not superadded.

But the question we are considering has a negative as well as positive side; and we will next inquire, what we anti-slavery Christians ought to refrain from doing.

1. We must not, in our efforts to subvert slavery, indulge in an unchristian spirit, or in language adapted needlessly to anger and alienate

those whom it should be our aim to win. A cause that is intrinsically good may be advocated in a bad spirit, or with improper weapons; and such may have sometimes been the case with ours. Would that all men had ever borne it in mind, that truth and love are the only weapons with which to wage a successful conflict with this or any other deep-seated moral evil.

2. We must not, in our zeal for emancipation, allow mere feeling or benevolent impulses partially to dethrone reason; and thus disqualify ourselves for taking impartial views of the subject, or for accurately discriminating between truth and error. There may have been men in the anti-slavery ranks, with whom sympathy was every thing, and reason — and even the Bible — comparatively nothing. In obeying the injunction to “remember them that are in bonds,” they may have neglected to remember any thing else. Slavery seemed to occupy their entire field of vision. Hence, not fully informed in regard to the actual condition of things at the South, they have erroneously supposed that the slave codes prevailing there were the standard by which to judge of the actual condition of the slaves, and that all the Southern church was actually practising the barbarities authorized by those codes. As there was no just appreciation

of the actual conduct of masters towards their servants, so there was no allowance made for the circumstances which conspired to render them masters, nor for the obstacles which stand in the way of their ceasing to be masters. It must be admitted, that generally, where unrighteous laws are suffered to exist, the mass of the community will not be better than the laws; but there are exceptions,—men who intend to give heed to a higher law. So much for allowing an amiable but blind sympathy to usurp that throne which reason and revelation were designed conjointly to occupy. It scarcely need be added, that these ultraisms have done much to prejudice the anti-slavery cause, and bring it, in the eyes of some, into unmerited contempt. We must wipe away that reproach, by so conducting our warfare with slavery as to evince that we are neither men of one idea, nor men whose judgment is led captive by their sensibilities.

3. We must not, in opposing slavery, indorse the sentiment, that one cannot in any conceivable circumstances give credible evidence of piety, and yet continue in form to hold slaves; that being a master is, in any and in all circumstances, a disciplinable offence in the church; or that it should, without exception, constitute a barrier

to church-membership, or to the communion of saints at Christ's sacramental board. While we believe that all the great principles of God's Word go to subvert slavery, and while we are constrained to regard the holding of slaves as diminishing the evidence of a man's piety, and thus far alienating his claims to a good standing in the Christian church, we may nevertheless make exceptions, and not keep a man out of the church, or discipline him when in it, merely because he sustains temporarily the relation of master, not for selfish ends, but, as in rare cases, for benevolent reasons. But if a man defends the system, and takes away from a fellow man inalienable human rights, then we may and should refuse him admission, or subject him to discipline, as the case may be. But, obvious and important as is this distinction, it is one which some anti-slavery men may have failed to make; and that failure may have prejudiced or retarded the cause of emancipation. A good cause suffers by having a single uncandid statement or untenable argument advanced in its support; and the friends of the enslaved must afford their opponents no room for saying, that their reasonings are illogical or anti-scriptural.

4. We must not, in seeking the extinction of



American slavery, so insist on its immediate abolition as to repudiate the responsibility which a master owes to this dependent and depressed class of his fellow beings; but that that end be kept steadily in view, to be accomplished as speedily as is consistent with the best good of the parties concerned. The immediate and total extinction of southern slavery, if not obviously impossible, is of questionable expediency. The upas of American slavery has struck its roots so deep, and shot its branches so far, and so interlaced itself with all surrounding objects, that, to have it instantaneously and unreservedly uprooted, might prove, in many cases, disastrous; and, at all events, is not to be expected. To say nothing of other obstacles to the immediate abolition of Southern slavery, the highest good of many of the slaves makes it inexpedient. Some, probably many of them, need to pass through an educating process, — a kind of mental and moral apprenticeship, — in order to their profiting largely by the boon of emancipation.\*

\* The publishers understand the writer to mean, that the working of them without wages, — the withholding that which is just and equal, — should be immediately and universally abandoned, and that emancipation should be granted as speedily as the slaves can be prepared to use and

II. We are now to inquire, lastly, what duties, positive and negative, this great question devolves on those Christians among whom  
— American slavery has its seat, or who are personally identified with it. Hoping, brethren, that the sentiments thus far advanced are your sentiments, I shall have your further assent when I say,

1. That the extinction, at the earliest consistent date, of the system of servitude existing among you, is a result at which you ought steadily and strenuously to aim. And, as you see, we base this obligation of yours, not on the assumption of any sinfulness which you may sustain to slavery, but on the acknowledged injustice and woes, past, present, and prospective, of the system as a system, — its contrariety, as a system, to the fundamental principles of Christianity. Did we regard you as necessarily sinners,

enjoy their freedom. The right should be acknowledged, and the needful means for its security immediately used. The writer does not say, that holding men in bondage is not generally sinful, nor that all sin should not be immediately repented of and forsaken, but only that there may be exceptions where for a time, and under very peculiar circumstances, it may not be sinful, and cannot consistently with the greatest good be abandoned, without some previous means of preparation.

if in any sense you hold slaves, then the least we could ask of you would be, that with contrition of heart you should instantaneously cease to indulge in this sin, for all sin should be immediately abandoned. As it is, we only ask, that, just as fast as your slaves can be prepared for freedom, and as the providence of God may put it in your power to liberate them, you will do so. We are not so unwise as to expect that the work of extinction can be accomplished in a day. We know, too, that you are not, in your church capacity, the constituted arbiters of the question as a question of State policy. And, so long as your legislatures and their constituencies are resolved on maintaining the system, perhaps you will be unable to effect as much as you desire in the way of promoting its overthrow. And yet, brethren, there is a way in which we think you can, with entire safety and manifest propriety, contribute largely and directly to the extinction of American slavery. Would the entire Southern church cease all personal participation in slavery, and throw her whole weight and influence into the scale of slavery's complete subversion, that "consummation devoutly to be wished" would soon ensue. Slave-holding, no longer practised or justified by the church, but discountenanced, could not long retain its foothold in the State. Now if this be

so, our slaveholding brethren will confess that they are imperiously bound, by motives of Christian duty, to liberate their bondmen with all consistent speed. Meantime, and as one important means of qualifying them for freedom, you ought,

2. To see to it that not only your own, but all the bondmen among you, — your entire slave population, — are furnished with the Bible, and qualified to read and comprehend it; and also with stated preaching. They need a written and preached gospel, were it only to fit them to exchange, with advantage, a state of vassalage for the dignity of freemen; for all experience proves that the Bible and the pulpit are of all instruments the best to qualify men safely to exercise the right of self-government. But there is a servitude more dreadful by far than any domestic bondage that men have ever groaned under; and your slaves need the Bible, and the Bible preached, to prove God's instruments of breaking the chains imposed by Satan, and making them Christ's freemen. Before God and in prospect of eternity, the distinctions between the master and his slave dwindle into insignificance. Having souls that are alike impure and alike precious, alike remembered by a dying Saviour and alike in need of the

regenerating change, they stand alike in need of God's Word, written and preached, as the Spirit's instrument in renewing and sanctifying the soul. Hence the Bible and preaching are as much the rightful inheritance of the slave as of the master. We rejoice that these truths and the obligations resulting therefrom are, to some extent, recognized by southern Christians; and that, in spite of certain adverse statutes, so much is being done there for the spiritual well-being of the slaves. Go on, brethren, in the good work of evangelizing your slave population; in teaching them the art of reading and the rudiments of knowledge; in putting the Bible into their hands, and affording them stated opportunities to read it, and to hear it expounded by you and by Christ's ministers. Go on, we say, till there be not one southern slave, who, in point of religious privileges, is not on a footing of equality with yourselves. Prosecuting this laudable work in the spirit of love, you will probably encounter no serious opposition. The adverse but dead statutes referred to will not, we hope, be galvanized into life, in order to oppose you.

It only remains that we name a few things, which we trust our Southern brethren will unite with us in saying that they should refrain from



doing. (1.) You ought not to, and we trust you will not, betray impatience and irritation, whenever we of the North attempt to press the claims of the enslaved on your attention. Your doing this, — as you sometimes have, — seems to indicate, that, in your opinion, we Northern Christians have no responsibility in regard to slavery and its evils; and that when we discuss this theme we make ourselves “busybodies in other men’s matters.” To the justness of this opinion we cannot subscribe. While we disclaim all right or intention to break our compact with you as States, we feel that American slavery is a question of too great moment to ourselves and to unborn generations for us to have no concern with or responsibility for; and as patriots, as philanthropists, as Christians, we are constrained to do all that we rightfully may for the downfall of this hoary system of wrong and woe. If any of you differ with us in opinion on this theme, we trust you will allow us to discuss it to our heart’s content; and that you will listen to our reasonings with Christian meekness and candor. Not to do so will be construed as an evidence of intrinsic weakness in your cause. (2.) You will freely admit, we presume, that certain practices are authorized by your slave laws, in which you must not indulge even so

long as by any necessity you hold slaves. Your slave codes, for example, do not recognize the sanctity of family ties and the domestic affections as existing among slaves ; but, as Christian masters, you must. You doubtless believe, as do we, that the marriage relation, with all its rights and immunities, was as much designed for the negro as for the white man ; that he, as truly as the other, is entitled to "cleave unto his wife," unexposed to the danger of man's putting asunder what God hath so closely joined, that "they are no more twain, but one flesh." You believe, too, that God united husband and wife thus indissolubly, not simply that they might be a help and solace to each other in the toilsome pilgrimage of life, but that the children with which God should bless them might grow up under their supervision, and by them be qualified for a career of usefulness and honor. Thus you believe, and believing thus, you will not, we trust, counteract God's benevolent designs, by countenancing, in your own practice, the separation of husbands and wives, or of parents and their offspring. We feel assured, that, whatever your laws may allow, or non-professing masters around you may do, you will never ignore the conjugal or parental rights of your servants, or indulge in any thing adapted to

mar their domestic enjoyment. Were you to do so, we confess we could not extend to you "the right hand of fellowship" as brethren in Christ. Were a church-member of ours to practise thus, we should regard him as amenable to discipline. We should also regard it as disciplinable for a master to overwork, or brutally chastise, or but half feed and clothe his servants; or to hold slaves for mere purposes of gain, or to traffic in them. None of these inhumanities could we reconcile with the obligations of a Christian profession; and we confidently hope that in these views you will heartily concur, and that with them your practice will correspond.

Christian brethren of the North and the South! The question we have been considering is one of vast moment. Upon the right disposition of it are suspended, under God, interests of immeasurable value, and which stretch far out into the unseen future of our country and the world. Coming ages and unborn generations are to be affected, favorably or otherwise, by the decision of this vexed question; and, brethren, unless I misjudge, its right decision is, to a very great extent, lodged in our hands. As decides the American church, so, methinks, will decide the American people. And now, — may I confess it? — I have dared to hope that the sentiments

of this Essay are not only sound, but in unison with the views of the great mass of American Christians. Are we not agreed in this: that American slavery is a system of deep injustice and wrong, not sanctioned by the Word or the providence of God; fraught with incalculable mischief to the interests of both masters, and slaves, and to the social and religious well-being of our whole country; a blot on the escutcheon both of the nation and of the church; a weapon for scepticism to wield, and an obstacle to the introduction of millennial glory; and hence, a system which ought speedily to terminate, and which all good men should unitedly oppose and seek to subvert? If we are thus agreed, let us join hands as well as hearts, and, swerving neither to the extreme of passive indifference on the one hand nor to that of erratic fanaticism on the other, in the majesty of principle let us move calmly onward, a phalanx of Christian philanthropists, attempting naught but what they are assured God would have them attempt, and employing only such means as are warranted by an enlightened conscience. Leaning prayerfully on Him who hears the sighing of the oppressed, let us push vigorously forward, and, though the year of jubilee has not yet fully come, be assured it will come,—that proud day, when not only

“throughout all the land,” but throughout the civilized world, liberty shall be proclaimed “unto all the inhabitants thereof.” Hasten its advent, “O Thou that hearest prayer,” and that “delightest in mercy!” Amen and Amen.







406

890  
096

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY •

